BAPTIST REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR

Vol. III. **July, 1906.** **No. 3.**

THE MAIN PURPOSE OF THE APOCALYPSE.*

BY PROF. J. H. FARMER, D. D., TORONTO, CANADA.

The Rigi and Pilatus are the northern sentinels of the Alps. The former is the mountain of the sunshine, the latter of the cloud. Stand on the Rigi Kulm under the blue sky, and though the sunshine sparkles on the Lake and glorifies a hundred peaks westward and southward, there to the northwest stands Pilatus cloud-capped and still—unless indeed, as often happens, he be in the tumult of a storm. For, as outpost of the Alps, he first confronts the storms that march from the north, and on his rugged height they often spend their force. The Apocalypse is the Pilatus of the New Testament.

I. It is a Book of Controversy. About it hover clouds of mystery. Around it rage the storms of disputation.

1. There is controversy as to its *author*. It is not the purpose of this article to discuss that. Enough to avow one's own belief that there is no sufficient reason in language, teaching or spirit to warrant one in refusing the almost unanimous tradition of the early centuries that it is the work of the Apostle John—the Son of Thunder whom Jesus loved.

2. There is controversy also as to *date*. On this I shall not dwell but again content myself with saying that other voices are not strong enough to drown the clear note of the Fathers that it was written in the time of Domitian, say about 95 A. D.

*Thankful acknowledgement is made of special indebtedness to the lectures of Dr. Broadus, and "The World Lighted" by Charles Edward Smith.

3. The chief controversy, however, has been about the *interpretation* of the book. What a multitude of theories, what a clash of opinions, there have been!

(1) The *Preterists* tell us it has all been fulfilled. Some of them say it refers on the one hand to the events of the three or four years that close with the destruction of Jerusalem, 70 A. D., and on the other, to the overthrow of heathenism in the death of Nero and the stop thus put to persecution. This view, of course, assumes the early date and has found great favor in Germany. Many like it because it makes so little of the predictive element. Others of this class believe that the book found fulfillment within the first three centuries after the death of Christ in the overthrow of Judaism in the second century and that of Pagan Rome in the first-quarter of the fourth. Yet the fact that Church and State were wed by Constantine, in which these Preterists see the fulfillment of the glorious victories symbolized in the closing chapters, seems to most Baptists, I presume, one of the most calamitous events in all history.

(2) The *Futurists* place all the events referred to in the future. One class refers them to the three and a half years immediately preceding the second advent. Others postpone all until after Christ has come.

(3) The *Historical* schools assert that the series of visions spans the whole period from the Apostle's time until the end. And here again different views appear. One school regards the three series of sevens—the seals, the trumpets, and the bowls—as continuous; another as synchronous. In the former case they are like the successive arches of a single bridge; in the latter, they are like three parallel bridges, each one of which spans the whole period from the first century to the end of the age. Others again feel that these visions may find many fulfillments among many different nations.

(4) Still others, *Idealists*, deny any literal fulfillment and see simply the play of great principles—the struggle and the ultimate triumph of the good. Now in the midst

of this uncertainty as to the proper interpretation of the book what are we to do? When the doctors differ so, what can ordinary mortals do? Many have answered that question by inventing a new view. Many, repelled by what they consider extreme and hurtful notions and dissatisfied with any theory that has been presented, have turned away from the book altogether. There is a better way.

II. The Main Purpose of the Book May be Known. In this respect also it is like Pilatus. For if you will spend the night on the Rigi and rise before the sun, while yet the mists sleep in the valleys and all the world is still, you may, in the gray morning, behold Pilatus with his face unveiled and learn the secret of his high places. So if one will come to this book when the world is still and the voices of controversy are hushed, at the quiet hour of devotion, seeking the hidden manna for the soul's sustenance, he may get the main message that the Master sends us through His servant John.

1. Surely *this is to be expected.* Is it at all likely that the chief blessing of the book should wait until all its mysteries had been solved? Or that only the few capable of recognizing in the broad field of history the events symbolized in it should share in that blessing? That is not the general spirit of Scripture which unfolds itself in its essence to those of child-like heart. Even though one may feel that a day may come when in manifested fulfillment it may vindicate its own inspiration and serve such purpose as prophecies of the Old Testament have served in their fulfillment, yet it is quite unlikely that this last voice from heaven should not have its message for the multitude of believers through the centuries.

2. And is this not *suggested* in the opening verses where blessing is pronounced upon him that readeth and upon them that hear the words of the prophecy and keep the things written therein? That brings before us the picture of the church assembled for worship where one reads and the others hear, and it implies two things,

namely: That ordinary Christians could understand the main teaching of the book and that practical obedience to that teaching was expected.

3. *How can we discover it?* By putting ourselves in their position; or in other words by noting the circumstances under which the message was given.

They are indicated in I. 9, where John refers to their common tribulation. He himself was an exile in Patmos, banished thither because of his fidelity in testifying to Jesus Christ. The ruthless Domitian had set himself to crush out the spreading gospel. The mighty power of Rome, so long a shelter, has now become an enemy. The last Apostle has been singled out, torn from the church he loved, and withdrawn from direct contact with those to whom for a generation his presence had been a benediction. Well might the churches in Asia feel disconsolate. And well might John, encompassed with the infirmities of age and oppressed with a sense of isolation and loneliness, feel the chill of discouragement and begin to wonder what it all meant. The old question might well recur, "Are there few that be saved?" Is sin always to triumph? As the Master Himself was slain, are his people too to be cut off? For there were other reasons for discouragement besides that of outward persecution. There was corruption and degeneracy among the churches themselves. False doctrines were harbored, gross immoralities were tolerated; the spirit of the world was gaining an ascendancy; and the love of many was growing cold. With such weakness within and persecution without, need we wonder if something of gloom should settle down upon the Apostle's spirit?

Nor is John alone in such experiences, John the Baptist had known it as he languished in the fortress of Machaerus. Peter refers to "the fiery trial" in his first letter and in his second has much to say of degeneracy within and opposition without. Jude follows in the same strain. And even Paul, dauntless hero, though he was, shows in his last letter a genuine tinge of sadness. Con-

trast it with the splendid hopefulness of his letter to the Romans or the optimistic outlook of the letters written during his first imprisonment. Something of the sombre shade of the dungeon has darkened the earthly prospect though the heavenward aspect cheers the old warrior's heart and peace reigns within.

Indeed this seems generally characteristic of the later apostolic age. In the early days the gospel went forth conquering and to conquer. Hope ran high and was fed by a succession of signal triumphs. Delightful is the fresh zeal and high courage that breathe through the book of Acts. It is an inspiring history of how the gospel spread from Jerusalem to Rome. But a change came; and the early buoyancy seemed to pass away. It looked as if the early promise was not being fulfilled, and timid questioning began to spring up in many a soul. Were the churches to sink into the weakness and corruption of the world about them? Or if a remnant escaped this contagion, was it to be exterminated by the hostile powers of the world? Such probably were the thoughts of John as in his weary exile, he restlessly turned the matter over in his mind. When Peter was thus distressed his heart was comforted by the promise of the Master's coming, the day of the Lord, and the new heavens and the new earth in which righteousness should have its abiding dwelling place. Jude, too, under like conditions is cheered by the thought of Him who is able to set the believer before the presence of His glory without blemish in exceeding joy. James bids suffering Christians be patient unto the coming of the Lord, and Paul, as the shadows gather about him, stays himself on the Lord who would save him unto His heavenly kingdom and exults in soul as he catches a glimpse of that radiant crown of righteousness which the righteous Judge should give him at that day.

Would it not be strange if to him whom Jesus loved no special word of comfort came amid the weakness of age, the loneliness of exile, and the soul agony he felt for the churches he had served so long? Could anything be

more fitting than that the Master should give His last inspired message through the last of the apostles or more natural than that that message should be comfort to His faithful ones and a warning to the unfaithful, through all the long centuries until He comes again? *That surely is the main purpose of the book—to comfort and to warn.* To say this is not to deny that there is in the visions a general forecast of the general outlines of the struggle between Christ and His enemies, or that these are worthy of study and may yet, when seen to be clearly fulfilled, serve some gracious purposes. But it does imply that these purposes are secondary in God's thought.

4. Note *how thoroughly adapted it is to that purpose.* The opening vision is that of the glorified Christ in the midst of His churches. "His countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength." In the presence of that glory John falls as one dead. But the old-time touch restores him and the familiar voice bids his fear depart. And, if one might venture, in imagination, to fill in the story it would run like this: The Lord might have said to John, "My son, you have been downcast and discouraged, you have been wondering whether my cause was not doomed to failure. But now do you not see that in me there is light enough for the whole world and power enough to vanquish every adversary" and John's reply might be: "Yea Lord; and yet men love the darkness, and still the enemy seem to triumph. And knowest thou, Lord, that thine own people are harboring the evil and turning themselves once more to idols."

Whereupon the Master takes him round the churches and as again and again He says, "I know thy works," John is made to feel that the Master's confidence is not due to ignorance of the conditions, but has good grounds. He proceeds to show the perplexed disciple what those grounds are and at the same time gives him a foreview of the struggle with evil and its final issue.

So in the fourth chapter John is shown a vision of the opened heaven—and there he beholds God Almighty seat-

ed upon His throne, language is beggared to describe His ineffable glory and infinite power. Compared with that the earth must have seemed small; Rome's power contemptible, and the devil's devices unavailing. Surely John's hope must revive and faith take on new strength. There is light enough in heaven to lighten the world, and power enough to vanquish all God's foes. But the victory is not just now. The struggle is to be long and to the churches trying. The panorama of that struggle is unrolled in a series of wonderful visions. It is like the conflict on the plain of Troy. Not earth alone but heaven as well is interested and shares in it. Sometimes the saints of the Almighty are discomfited, their ranks shattered and the surviving remnant driven into the wilderness. Again the enemy are defeated and hallelujahs fill the heavenly regions. So for long long ages the tide of battle ebbs and flows, the slow fierceness of the struggle involves unspeakable suffering and hardship, and calls for and develops the patience of the saints. But the issue is that Christ conquers and reigns. The former things pass away—the sin, the sorrow, and the weariness; the heavens and the earth are made new; the New Jerusalem comes down from heaven resplendent with glory; and the saints enter upon their eternal service with everlasting joy upon their heads.

5. That *these visions brought John comfort* is perfectly evident. Is that not implied in the twentieth verse of the closing chapter? Does the glorified Jesus not virtually say to him "You thought my cause was losing; but lo! I am on the way to victory and the throne; yea and I am coming to it quickly?" And John responds "Amen, keep coming, Lord Jesus." For must not the present imperative which John employs emphasize the thought of progress while not excluding the transcendent event in which that progress finds its culmination? It is quite natural accordingly that when John sits down to pass the message on to the churches he should feel assured of the blessedness of the faithful ones who should receive it (I. 3).

The Apocalypse which comforted him would comfort their hearts also.

And what it did for them it has been doing for God's suffering saints all through the centuries. Has any book of Scripture ministered more strengtheningly in days of persecution than this? Let the heroic Vaudois in Alpine valleys, or the sturdy Covenanters in the glens of Scotland answer. It is equally true of the more common sorrows of life. How the eyes of age to which earth's scenes are growing dim love to linger upon the pages that tell of that new life that never knows weariness, the new city whose inhabitants never grow old. How often the poor sufferer, tossing in pain through weary hours of a slow disease, has called for some loved one to read those glowing chapters that tell of the time when there shall be no more pain or crying, no more dying or mourning, when God Himself shall wipe away all tears from their eyes! How often the book has brought cheer to the poor, the discouraged, the outcast, the oppressed! How often, by its hope of reward, it has nerved to fidelity; braced for self-denial, and made brave to endure the crucifixion of our "members that are upon the earth.' Unquestionably its chief ministry has been to our times of sorrow and struggle, perplexity and gloom. This is the obverse of the coin—a message of comfort, an incentive to fidelity.

6. The reverse is that it issues a warning to the churches.

There is warning against false doctrine, which it combats by holding before us in striking ways the fundamental doctrines of the faith. Could the deity of Christ, for example, be more emphatically proclaimed than it is in v. 8-14 where the same worship is paid to the Lamb as unto God Almighty—especially when one contrasts it with xxii. 8, 9 where the mighty angel so promptly refuses the worship John was about to offer and bids him worship God. So the atonement by blood is constantly meeting us. We "are loosed from our sins in His blood" (I. 5). The new song is "Worthy art Thou—for Thou

wast slain and didst purchase unto God with Thy blood men of every tribe and tongue and people and nation." The ever-recurring title "Lamb" keeps this doctrine ever before us. So the resurrection is everywhere implied, and in the Lord's first word expressly stated, "I was dead" He says "and behold I am alive for evermore." Even the mysterious doctrine of the Trinity is implied in I. 4, 5, in each of the last four letters to the churches (e. g. iii. 21, 22) and elsewhere. The everlasting Gospel is the means of conquest, the power of God unto salvation, as unmistakably as in Paul's letter to the Romans.

There are also the sternest possible warnings against unrighteousness. Conduct is regarded even more than creed. Sin will not go unpunished. It will never pay to do wrong. One feels as he reads that heaven is near with its exhaustless power and ever with the right. His reward is with Him to give to every man according as his work shall be.

Along with this is shown the sin and folly of relying upon any earthly power as against God. The mightiest combinations of evil whether beast or Babylon, opposing State or Apostate church, shall fall. The way of wisdom is to stand true to Jesus and so share in His victory and glory.

III. Finally because this is the purpose of the book it becomes to us *the crowning glory of the Bible* just in proportion as we know and feel what it is to suffer with and for Christ. They who glide smoothly with the currents of worldly thought and practice, and have never felt the pangs of self-crucifixion or the hardships of warfare for the sake of Christ and his truth, are not likely to find anything very attractive about it. It will be to them as the Lord Himself was to many "a root out of a dry ground, without form or comeliness." But to those who do know what it means to lose and suffer and endure for Christ's sake, the book with its sure promise of victory and reward becomes like Him "altogether lovely" and perhaps the chiefest book of all. It becomes inspiring in

the highest degree and forms a fitting close to the sacred writings. Though it begins in mystery and gloom, and passes on through struggle and conflict, it ends in light and peace, in gladness and glory. Pilatus still remains its fitting symbol. Some of us remember how in the gray dawn as from the Rigi we gazed upon his cloudless summit a sudden storm came from the northwest, broke in fury upon his brow, swept across the Lake a blinding mist and drove us to our rooms. Fifteen minutes later as I looked out the western window, there appeared a small rift in the clouds through which I caught sight of Finsteraarhorn, fifty miles away, just as his snowy peak began to kindle with the first rays of the rising sun. The rift widened, and there before our eyes peak after peak caught the growing splendor. It seemed as if the glory of heaven were descending upon the earth bathing it in light supernal. By and by we walked out again to the kulm and looked toward Pilatus. There he stood silent, majestic and crowned with a wealth of cloud—not now, however, the sombre cloud of yesterday, nor the storm-cloud of an hour before, but mountain masses of cumulus shot through and through with the many-colored splendors of the morning. He was transfigured. The mountain of mystery had become the mount of glory.

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL OF DAY AFTER TO-MORROW.

BY BISHOP JOHN H. VINCENT, D. D., INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

1. The School of yesterday is the old-time Sunday School for children with its earnest teachers and limited facilities. And it did a good work.

2. The School of to-day is an advance upon that of yesterday.

3. The School of to-morrow will perhaps be as great an advance upon our present system as we imagine ours to be in advance of that which our good old grandfathers developed.

4. But I plead for such an emphasis upon "certain fundamentals" that we may begin to look and plan for the Sunday School of Day After To-morrow—something better than the next few years is likely to realize—the church school at its best—better than our best— a school built upon certain fundamentals, evangelical, psychological, social, educational and spiritual; a school that will embrace all the educating, evangelizing, and edifying factors of Home, Pulpit, Pastorate, School, Press, Civilization—in a noble unity. There may be some formal organization by which we shall secure the benefits of co-operation and economy.

5. Too few of us appreciate the unity of this wonderful Book of God; the emphasis it puts on teaching, the profound pedagogic wisdom, that fills its pages from Genesis to Revelation. And teachers—professional teachers—the teachers of teachers, have gone to it to find the profoundest philosophy and the wisest and most concrete illustrations of a perfect teaching system the world and the ages have ever known. The School of day after to-morrow will follow its guidance. And if you will not be tangled up by my play on words—the yesterdays and to-morrows

of which I have spoken (perhaps an apparently trifling mnemonic device) I will say first of all that "the school of day after to-morrow" must be a reproduction of "the school of day before yesterday."

6. In a word our ideals of the church, the school and the family, must be drawn, not from the theories, policies and ideals of the present, nor of the immediate past, but from the principles and precedents laid down in God's Word.

7. The school of day before yesterday is set forth in the Bible—its roots and trunk in the Old Testament and its branches and fruit in the New. Our best school of the future is to be found in the Bible. Let us go in quest of it there. When I want a forecast of the best that God can do for man and the best that man can do in his work for God and humanity I go to the Bible. And as far as I can understand the subject I sympathize heartily with reverent modern criticism.

8. If a philanthropist in New York desiring to educate a waif picked up from the streets of that city were to ask foremost educators of the present age what steps he should take in order effectively to accomplish his work they would suggest substantially as follows: Separate the lad from his present unfavorable conditions; arrest his attention; give him new ideas so that he may be ensphered in a new world; use, as you will be compelled to do, the object method of instruction; whatever else you do win his confidence, his affections and his will; and be patient and persevering in your efforts in his behalf.

9. Now, as I review this hurried and superficial, yet on the whole, comprehensive Counsel, I recall the divine processes in the same direction when God took in hand a waif, thousands of years ago, on the banks of the Nile, and through divine processes led Israel out of an old land and its slavery into another land and through long century processes created a new civilization, not as yet quite completed, and the end of it all—of all the centuries of effort, of beginnings, of failures, of renewed endeav-

ors, of divine and supernatural interpolations—national, racial, personal, spiritual—will be the noble school of a Christian civilization a little later on—the school of day after to-morrow.

10. The Christ study of the old Jewish Tabernacle, that great kindergarten of religion and of theology, was a complicated object lesson, a mold for a new language to express new and divine ideas.

11. Stand with me for a moment on a rock near the base of Sinai and watch the splendor of that object lesson. The hidden priest is in the holy of holies. All at once behold the mysterious transformation. Everything vanishes—curtains, altars, sacrifices, candlestick, sacred ark, mercy-seat, cherubim, all gone! The robes of the high priest, his crown and all his official glory—gone! The shekinah fades. The cloud itself disappears. What is left? All that is worth while— a man in plain Israelitish costume bowing reverently under the cloudless heaven in personal communion with God!

12. This is the ripe fruit of the whole ceremonial system—of all the doctrines and precepts and institutes of Judaism—man the individual alone a worshipper before the unseen God—himself the temple of God. "Neither in this mountain nor yet at Jerusalem" is God to be sought. "God is a spirit." All men as men, all women, all children, anywhere, everywhere, may through Jesus, whom all these things foreshadowed, have immediate access to God. Altars and incense, candles and sacrifices, splendors of ritual, all the kindergarten apparatus of the infantile period of the race have been superseded—abolished as belonging to an initial period in an educational process. Lessons in the alphabet are no longer needed by the student in the university. Judaism was only the preparation for Christ. And Christ having come and the Spirit having been given every individual believer has all this within his personality and the invisible spiritual environment in which he lives, including the fellowship of other

believers; all that the Jewish theology kindergarten contained and foreshadowed.

13. And really a few centuries later when the plain Christ appeared among men the world saw that whole Jewish system free from all its externals and cumbersome and complicated ritual. They saw the plain man in everyday costume living among men, talking in simple and natural fashion to men, teaching, demonstrating by the deeds of grace and help that he wrought what the teaching work of the church was to be. And later on, before He passed again into the heavens He gave His commission to His followers. The Church is to preach His gospel, to make disciples and then to teach these disciples and the church becomes the aggressive teaching power in the world with simple symbolic and commemorative observances—Baptism and The Lord's Supper—freed as far as possible from ritualistic rites, having as its motto and keynote: "We look not at the things that are seen but at the things that are not seen." And to aid this we have the Sabbath Day retained as the Lord's day and a great Book that records God's way with the race and the assurance that "all Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, completely furnished unto all good works."

14. And we have the church that is a school of personal character under the leading of the personal Christ through the Holy Spirit. The church is to set forth the Word of Life, to preach, to teach, to lead, to train, to comfort, to defend the truth and become the center of a splendid school of eternal life using all agencies in this work and so controlling civilization that our national, political, social and educational life may all contribute to the building up of Christ's kingdom. "All things are yours." In every realm where you have an ounce of influence you are responsible for the use of it.

15. The Jewish system was incomplete without Christ.

He came to fulfill its foreshadowings as the great teacher and sacrifice and He abolished all mere incidents and artificialities of religion, provided the simplest possible external service and commissioned his disciples to go abroad and teach. His commission has molded a new civilization and put this civilization at work as a school of truth and righteousness. Jesus suggested no robes of office, provided no ritual, ignored all mere externals beyond the simple appointment of baptism, the Lord's Supper and the setting apart of certain believers to the work of the ministry. The Christianity of the New Testament is at the last remove from the ceremonialism of Judaism. That was kindergarten. It served its purpose and has passed away.

16. But the work of teaching did not pass away. The ministry was pre-eminently a ministry of teaching—of simple everyday, straightforward teaching with no regulations about costumes, programs, symbols, ceremonies. The complicated paraphernalia of ritualism now played with by Roman, Greek and high Anglican ecclesiastics has no place in New Testament Christianity. See the plain peasant of Nazareth as he sat on the well of Shechem under the shadow of Gerizim. The woman of Samaria found opportunity to put what was to her the question of questions between Jews and Samaritans—the place of worship! "Is it this mountain? Is it Jerusalem?" See the face of the Master as he replies, "Neither in this mountain nor yet at Jerusalem shall men worship the Father. God is a Spirit and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." In this scene we have a representative of the teaching process that was to supplement Judaism—the emphasis of Christ's own words and an example of the highest of Christian pedagogic methods.

1. It was an individual process, the emphasis on the unit, "To every creature."

2. It was by conversation—not oratory, but simple talk—saying, suggesting, starting questions, answering one

question by asking another, stimulating the curiosity of the individual, one at a time or two or three in conversation; no oration, no studied eloquence, no elocution, no display, but simply telling and talking in neighborly conversation.

3. The teaching process of the New Testament found its stimulus not only in conversation with units and groups, but its highest inspiration in private prayer. It was in personal communion with the Father that Jesus found (and all his true successors will find) the secret force that made conversation effective.

4. The conversation, teaching, preaching method of Christ was radiant with parables, incidents, figures of speech, metaphors, and especially biographical and personal applications, "Without a parable spoke He not unto them." What use he would make to-day of science, of electricity, of the telegraph and the telephone and the latest mystery of wireless fellowship through unmeasured distances!

5. Let me emphasize the individual process which is indispensable to success in church life and work. The mass must be served, the class cared for, but mass and class are made up of units. It is not enough to preach to a congregation. Some do that. The value of a congregation is in the individuals that compose it and in the knowledge of the units which preacher, teacher or lecturer has; and the aim of his service must be the improvement of the individual.

17. The Sunday School of day-after-to-morrow will be:

1. A school of supernatural ministry.

2. It must begin with and embrace home.

3. It will be a school taught by plain every-day men—men who pray, men who teach by what they are, men who teach chiefly in conversation.

4. It will be a school whose largest power will be in action. The noblest oratory is action. Do you know how God speaks? He acts! "He made known His ways unto Moses, His acts unto the Children of Israel." So it was

with the whole history of Israel. So it was with Jesus. He did not write, He wrought.

5. Again in the school of day-after-to-morrow we shall return to the divine way of emphasizing biographical study. History is biography. Politics is biography. The Bible is biography. Christianity is the making of biography—"the living epistle read and known of all men."

18. Thus the school of day-after-to-morrow should embrace all the factors of life as set forth in God's Word—living, thinking, praying, demonstrating, conversing, doing, writing, printing, persevering in preaching and persuading men to accept the truth.

19. Let us turn the whole world, including the overarching heavens into our school room—our university. Let us turn the whole of life into our school term. Let us dedicate to God the universe that our eyes behold and all the facilities that our place in the world and life embrace and let us each one of us be in God's home our school now and always.

MOSES IN ARCHAEOLOGY AND CRITICISM.

BY PROF. A. H. SAYCE, D. D., OXFORD UNIVERSITY, ENGLAND.

We all know the Moses of tradition—the Hebrew hero, the deliverer of the Israelites from Egyptian bondage, the first of legislators, the compiler of the Pentateuch. Cast adrift on the Nile and rescued by the daughter of Pharaoh, a fugitive in Midian from the vengeance of the Egyptian government, a worker of miracles who brought the ten plagues upon the land of Egypt, he led his people to the edge of the Promised Land, and then died, alone with his God, on the summit of Pisgah, so that "no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day." Such was the Moses of tradition, the Moses whose story has claimed the belief of generation after generation for more than two thousand years.

The Moses of tradition has disappeared in the crucible of twentieth century criticism. There was no babe left to die in his cradle of bulrushes on the Nile; similar stories were told of other national heroes, of Romulus at Rome and of Sargon the Elder in Babylonia; it was but a folk-tale that came perhaps from Babylonia. There were no ten plagues, for they are all represented as miraculous, and the very mention of a miracle in a narrative makes it suspicious; criticism admits of nothing that savours of a miracle in the history that it reconstructs. There was no miraculous passage of the Red Sea and destruction of pursuing hosts; if the Israelites escaped from Egypt at all, they were but a small company of despised and insignificant serfs whom the Pharaoh would never have thought of pursuing with his armies. There was no legislation, for a code of laws at so early a date is inconceivable. There was no compilation of the Pentateuch, for if Moses and his compatriots existed they would have been unable to read or write. Has not Wolf shown that

there were no books even in the Greek world of the sixth century B. C.?

Moreover criticism has succeeded in analysing the Pentateuch into minute parts, in dividing even a single verse among three different writers, and none of these parts is as old as the age assigned to Moses. Indeed between the earliest of them and the Mosiac age there is a gap of several centuries. The legislation assigned to the single hero was the work of anonymous and for the most part self-interested priests, which extended over a great length of time. The critic can distinguish in it at least three successive strata, the earlier of which were revised and supplemented by the latter as priestly authority became more confirmed and priestly greed more grasping. In a hodge-podge of this sort, separated from its legendary author by so great a space of time, and written to a large extent with the purpose of claiming divine authority for a late ceremonial law, it is useless to look for history. When there were no books to hand it down, anything like authentic history was necessarily out of the question.

Here, however, twentieth century criticism ceases to be consentient. Some writers draw the logical conclusion that Moses never existed, and that the Israelites were never in the land of Goshen, or at any rate that we have no evidence for believing that they were. Other writers, less logical, or more influenced by old associations, shrink from so extreme a scepticism, and in spite of their premisses still cling to the belief that there was a Moses and even a Jewish legislator, though they have themselves destroyed all valid grounds for such a belief. As long as we confine ourselves to the Old Testament, an analysis of the Pentateuch which results in assigning it to a number of different and very inharmonious writers who lived long after the Mosiac period has only one logical conclusion—if there ever was a Moses, there is no literary evidence of the fact.

But the critical analysis of the Pentateuch involves

certain prodigious assumptions. First of all, that we are better acquainted with ancient Hebrew than we are with modern English. Secondly, that the student of the West is a competent judge of the motives and points of view of the ancient oriental. And thirdly, that what the critic imagines ought to have been the particular line of evolution in religious ideas actually was so. As a matter of fact, we cannot dissect into its component parts an English work which we know to have been written by two—much more three—persons. The critics who can distinguish with such mathematical precision the various "sources" of the Pentateuch cannot separate Besant from Rice in one of the novels which bear their conjoint names, or pick out the individual authors of the leading articles in a newspaper. And yet Hebrew is not only a dead language; all our acquaintance with it is confined to a limited number of books, and our knowledge of its grammar, and still more of its vocabulary is very imperfect. In fact, it is just because of our ignorance that it has seemed possible to dissect the Pentateuch; the field of comparison is not large enough to check and correct our supposed results.

For comparison is the instrument of science, and where the materials for comparison are wanting, a scientific conclusion is impossible. Criticism is still debating whether the Apocalypse and the Gospel of St. John are by the same author, although Greek is a European and not a Semitic language, and our knowledge of Greek is infinitely greater than our knowledge of Hebrew. But it is just because of this that the criticism of the New Testament is more modest than the criticism of the Old Testament; the more we know, the wider the range of our materials, the more difficult it is to come to a conclusion when the subject in hand is purely literary.

One reason for this is that in such cases the evidence is philological, and from philological premisses only philological conclusions can be drawn. The province of the grammarian is grammar, not history. A study of the

words of a language or of a document will tell us in what way they have been read at a particular time, what their history has been and what their relation is to the words of another language; it cannot tell us anything about the history of the people who spoke them or of the individual authors who employed them. There was a time, indeed, when the comparative philologist thought that, in the case of the Indo-European languages at any rate, it was possible to extract from them a picture of the primitive "Aryan" community; but the picture was wiped out by anthropology, and the scientific philologist of to-day recognizes that language and history belong to different provinces. There is a history of words, but out of words we cannot construct history.

The picture which the comparative philologist had drawn of the prehistoric Aryan community was shown to be a fiction when confronted with anthropology. The negative picture of the analyst of the Pentateuch belongs, not to the prehistoric age, but to the middle of the historical age of Western Asia, and oriental archæology has now given us the means of testing its truth. For archæology is scientific history, that is to say, history as gathered not merely from literary sources, but from contemporaneous evidence, which can for the most part be handled and felt. In place of the subjective impressions and "literary tact" of the critic we have the testimony of pottery and similar objects which are like the fossils of the geologist or the chemical elements and compounds with which the chemist deals; in place of books written long after the events they narrate, which have come down to us through numerous copyists, and the language of which admits of more than one interpretation, we have contemporaneous annals and first-hand documents. The method of archæology is that of the other inductive sciences, and its conclusions, therefore, have the same scientific authority. In the words of German philosophy they are "objective" and not "subjective."

Now it so happens that the Mosaic age is one about

which oriental archæology has a good deal to say. And what it has to say by no means agrees with the conclusions of the literary criticism of the Pentateuch. Between this and the results of archæological science there is about the same relation as between the philological picture of the primitive Aryan community and the results of authropological research.

In the first place, the Mosiac age, we have now learnt, was a highly literary one. It came at the end of a long-preceding period of literary culture and intercourse. All over Western Asia there were roads along which the postman travelled and letters passed to and fro between Babylonia and Egypt, between Canaan and Cappadocia. Libraries were multiplied all over the East, and Canaan was filled with schools where the foreign script and language of Babylonia were taught and learned. In Egypt the commonest articles of every-day life were inscribed, and even the potters had a system of writing of their own. The overseers of the workmen were required to be able to read and write like the heads of the villages or of the tribes who were settled in the land. As in Babylonia, so too in Egypt, books had been written and edited from a remote antiquity; in Egypt even the historical novel had come into existence, and the Egyptian gentleman counted among the future delights of Paradise the enjoyment of books. In Canaan the petty shêkhs of third-class towns, like Taanach, were writing to one another about their private affairs in the foreign language of Babylonia and in the complicated cuneiform syllabary. And in this correspondence women took part, not only in Babylonia, but also in Canaan. If Moses and his people had been brought up in Egypt, it would have been nothing short of a miracle had neither he nor the Israelitish upper classes been able to read and write.

In the second place, a codification of law in the Mosaic age, so far from being "inconceivable," turns out to have been the most natural thing in the world. Eight centuries previously Khammu-rabi or Amraphel king of

Babylonia had codified the Babylonian law, and a copy of his code is now in the Museum of the Louvre. Khammu-rabi was king of Canaan as well as of Babylonia, Canaan being at the time a province of the Babylonian empire, and the Babylonian law was consequently in use there also. Hence the code was known and obeyed not only in the country of Abraham's birth, but also in that of his adoption, and the conception of it had been familiar to the inhabitants of Western Asia and Egypt long before the Israelites left the land of Goshen. The code had been compiled out of the case-law of Babylonia, the individual laws in it being the decisions given by the judges in actual cases which had come before them; each law is, therefore, introduced by an "if." The individual laws of the civil code of Israel have precisely the same form (Exod. XXI., etc.), and the account of the manner in which they had first been laid down (given in Exod. XVIII. 21-26) exactly agrees with what we now know to have been the origin of the laws of the Babylonian code. The compilation of the civil code of Moses was but an imitation of that of the Babylonian code which had so long been in force in Western Asia and with which the civilized world of the East must have been thoroughly acquainted.

Then, thirdly, the very name of "Israelites" has been found on an Egyptian monument. The discovery was unexpected, for it seemed probable that the Egyptians were as little likely to record the name of the Hebrew serfs as the Anglo-Egyptians of to-day are to record the name of the Bedâwin in the eastern part of the Delta, more especially if these same serfs had escaped after bringing disaster upon their masters. Nevertheless, the unexpected has happened. In 1896 Prof. Flinders Petrie discovered at Thebes a stela containing a poem in honor of Meneptah, on which the name of the Israelites is spelt in full. Their "seed" is said to have been destroyed so that their kinsfolk in the land of the Horites, or Edom, have become "as widows" for want of men to marry. As

the determinative of "country" is not attached to the name of the Israelites as it is to those of the other peoples mentioned along with them, it would appear that though the Israelites had already fled from Egypt they had not as yet conquered a new home for themselves in Palestine.

That Meneptah, the son and successor of Ramses II. of the nineteenth dynasty, was the Pharaoh of the Exodus, has long since been recognized by the Egyptologists—supposing, that is, that credence should be given to the story of the Pentateuch. Here we read (Exod I. 11) that the Pharaoh of the Oppression built Pithom and Raamses with Israelitish labour. That Ramses II. was the builder of the city of Ramses or Raamses in the Delta was already known from a papyrus, and Prof. Naville's excavations at Patum, the Biblical Pithom, proved that Ramses II. was the founder also of this latter city. Ramses II. was the greatest of Egyptian builders; all over Egypt he built, repaired and restored—or in some cases deformed—and foreign captives and royal serfs were employed in his works. He died after a long reign of sixty-seven years and was followed by his son Meneptah II., whose accession is referred to in Exod. II. 23. Then it was, according to the Old Testament narrative, that Moses returned from Midian to Egypt and demanded of the new Pharaoh that he should let the people of Israel "go three days' journey into the desert" that they might sacrifice unto the Lord their God. Since his predecessor had built Pithom and Raamses, and Egyptian discovery has shown that their builder was Ramses II., it follows that Meneptah must have been the Pharaoh of the Exodus.

Once this is admitted the archæological facts fit in with the Biblical story. The exceptionally long reign of Ramses II and his mania for building agree with the use made of the children of Israel as well as with the length of time during which it is implied that their oppression lasted. Forty years, it is true, and its multiples signify merely an indefinite or unknown period of time in

Hebrew idiom (see for example 2 Sam. XV. 7, compared with XIII. 38, XIV. 28), but Moses was already a grown man when he left Midian, so that we may suppose him to have been at least thirty years of age. In the latter part of the reign of Ramses the power of Egypt had begun to wane, and there were signs that invaders might again assail it on its Asiatic frontier as had been the case in times past. The Asiatic tribe, therefore, settled in the land of Goshen on the eastern side of the Delta was a standing danger; an Asiatic invader might find in them useful allies, and in view of their rapid increase it seemed sound policy to break their spirit and limit the number of their male offspring. Hence we can understand why the Israelitish herdsmen of Goshen were transformed into the Pharaoh's serfs who had to toil for him at his numerous buildings in the Delta, and why the order was issued to destroy their male seed.

The invasion actually came in the fifth year of Meneptah. Egypt was attacked on both sides, by the Libyans from the west and by the nations of Asia Minor and the Greek seas from the north. The invaders made their way across the Delta and encamped near the modern Belbeis at the western extremity of the land of Goshen and not far from the site of Pithom. The fears of Ramses were thus justified, and though the invading troops were eventually defeated in a decisive battle, the Delta had been ravaged and the Egyptian monarchy had never been nearer its overthrow. That the enemy should have encamped on the borders of Goshen is significant; it is still more significant that immediately after the invasion is over we find the land of Goshen is empty.

In the account of the invasion we are told that this land "had been left as pasture for cattle for the sake of the foreigners, abandoned (to them) since the days of (Meneptah's) ancestors." The "foreigners" were still there with their "tents" when the invasion took place. But three years later a letter was written to the king, the papyrus original of which is now in the British

Museum. In this the writer says: "Here is another matter for the consideration of my master. We have allowed the tribes of the Bedâwin (Shasu) from the land of Edom to pass the fortress of Meneptah in the land of Succoth (Thukut), (and go) to the lakes of Pithom of Meneptah in the land of Succoth, in order to feed themselves and to feed their herds on the great estate of the Pharaoh, the beneficent sun of all countries. (Dated) the year 8." Consequently, between the 5th and the 8th years of Meneptah the pasturage land of Succoth or Goshen had been denuded of its population. The fact that the land of Goshen was regarded as an estate of the Pharaoh throws light on its gift to Joseph's brothers as well as on the right of Ramses II to turn the herdsmen settled in it into his own workmen. Its Hebrew title was derived from the name of the capital of the District Kosem in Egyptian, now Saft-el-Henna, which was excavated by Prof. Naville in 1884.

We may perhaps infer that the escape of the Israelites from their "house of bondage" was aided by the Libyan invasion. At all events we are told that "a mixed multitude" accompanied them in their flight, which led them from Raamses to Succoth, then to Etham, the Egyptian Khetem, and to "the sea." This geography agrees exactly with what the papyri of the age of Ramses and Meneptah have informed us was the geography of the eastern Delta at this particular age. And it is noticeable that it was a geography which does not suit any other period. Raamses had no existence before the time of Ramses II. and falls out of sight after the epoch of the nineteenth dynasty, while Etham, "in the edge of the wilderness," is either the Khetem or "Fortress" of Ramses II on the border of the desert or the Khetem of Meneptah "in the land of Succoth," both of which disappear from later history.

The Exodus of Israel centers around the figure of Moses. He is presented to us as at once an Israelite,—full of patriotism and sympathy with his fellow-tribes-

men,—and as the adopted son of an Egyptian princess who had been brought up at the Egyptian court where he had been instructed in all the literary "wisdom of the Egyptians" and had learnt the art and principles of statecraft. In the age of the nineteenth dynasty we find other Semites similarly rising to posts of influence at the Pharaoh's court where (like Joseph in earlier days) they assumed Egyptian names. Thus the prime-minister of Meneptah was a certain Ramses-em-pe-Ra, whose father, Ben-Mazan, had come from the land of Bashan and settled in Egypt and there received the name of "Yu the Elder." Moses, or rather Mosheh as it is written in Hebrew, the name given by the daughter of Pharaoh to "the child" she had rescued from the water, was a common Egyptian name at the time. It is generally transcribed Messu by Egyptologists and signified "son" or "child." A governor of Ethiopia under Ramses II. bore it, so also did another governor of Ethiopia under Meneptah, who has left a record of himself on the granite rocks of the First Cataract, not far from the modern Cataract Hotel. Another Egyptian name of the same period was Pi-Nehasi "the Negro," which we find again in Phinehas the grandson of Aaron.

The flight of Moses to Midian and his subsequent return to Egypt is curiously paralleled in the history of an Egyptian named Saneha who lived many centuries earlier in the time of the twelfth dynasty and whose biograpgy has been preserved in a papyrus. Why Moses should have fled so far as Midian from the vengeance of the Egyptian government has now been made clear to us by the hieroglyphic inscriptions discovered in the Sinaitic Peninsula. The turquoise mines of Sinai had been worked by the Egyptians from a very early epoch, and the Peninsula (or Market as it was called), was an Egyptian province, possessing an Egyptian temple and stations for Egyptian soldiers. If, therefore, the fugitive wished to be beyond the reach of the Egyptian power and

to evade the Egyptian garrisons, Midian was his nearest point of safety.

Midian was at the time ruled by a high-priest. This, too, is in agreement with the latest results of archæological research. The early inscriptions found in Arabia have disclosed the fact that there, as in Assyria, the "high-priest" preceded the "king." The high-priest did not become a king until after the Mosiac age was past.

On the ten plagues archæology is not likely to throw any direct light. The native monuments of Egypt are not likely to record national disasters. The Pharaohs describe their triumphs, but naturally not their defeats. Those, however, who have lived in Egypt know that the ten plagues were but intensified examples of the common visitations of the country. Year by year at the time of inundation the Nile becomes blood-red and is for a short while undrinkable; frogs and lice, and still more flies, are annual plagues—the plague of flies, indeed, it may be said, has never been removed. The cattle of Egypt at present are but just recovering from a "murrain" which has all but destroyed them, and boils and blains are the commonest of diseases. More than once during the past ten years the crops have been ruined by the hail and rain of violent thunder-storms, and the locust is still a cause of dread. Even the plague of darkness can be matched to a limited extent by the darkness occasioned by a bad "khamasin," when the sun becomes invisible from the blinding dust which fills the air and produces a darkness that "may be felt." And cholera and plague carry away their victims in a few hours. The "ten plagues" were characteristic of Egypt and, as a whole, of no other country on the globe.

Here, however, we pass from archæology to the modern world. What archæology has done and is doing is to recreate the age in which Moses lived, and the social, political and geographical conditions under which he was born. Thanks to recent research and discovery that age

is now becoming as well known to us as the age of Alexander the Great, and we have at last a scientific test for determining how far the history contained in the Pentateuch is trustworthy. We can now compare its statements with the contemporaneous records of the epoch to which it professes to belong, and see whether or not it agrees with them. We have been told that the use of writing for literary purposes was unknown in the Mosiac age and that consequently the books ascribed to that age must be of much later date, and now archæology has shown us that the age was really almost as literary as ours. We have been assured that a codification of law in the time of Moses was inconceivable, and we have learned that a code of law, obeyed in Canaan as well as in Babylonia, had been compiled eight centuries before he was born. It has been asserted that the geography of the Exodus was the invention of Jewish writers of a late date, and we now find that it agrees with the map of north-eastern Egypt as it existed in the epoch of the nineteenth dynasty and at no other period. It has been maintained that the story of the Exodus has no standing place in actual history, and contemporaneous monuments have now proved that it is in full harmony with the political circumstances of the time. Moses himself has been pronounced to be a myth, and, behold, the very name has turned up in hieroglyphic inscriptions. Of the two pictures that have been presented to us, the picture of the Moses of tradition and the picture of the Moses of criticism, the second has been demolished by the archæological facts. All we can say of the first is that much of it has been directly or indirectly supported by the progress of archæological discovery, that there is nothing, or little, in it which is inconsistent with what we now know to have been the history and condition of the oriental world in the age of Ramses and Meneptah.

SOME PHASES OF THE ETHICAL CHARACTER OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE ETHICS OF ANCIENT ORIENTAL PEOPLES.

BY IRA MAURICE PRICE, PH. D., LL. D.,
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

The morals of a person or a people are a true index of character. The ethical code of the Old Testament has been, and is to-day, a stumbling-block for many to belief in the Bible. It is presented, however, not as an organized and complete system of morals, but is rather gathered up from here and there throughout the various and diverse books and set forth in accordance with modern occidental methods.

The necessity of treating this theme is increasingly apparent. To some readers, the Old Testament is full of the impossible, and inexplicable, and the unthinkable. Many of its characters, though nominally believers in God, they say, were inexpressibly bad, and their conduct such as to condemn them without a hearing. Their code of morals would not be tolerated in any civilized nation on earth, and their presence in the Old Testament involves the whole book in their guilt. With such a decision there is large sympathy on the part of the apathetic who are looking for some pretext behind which they can hide their neglect and their indifference.

Again, some of the most vigorous and telling attacks on the Old Testament, and that includes the New as well, have been and are hurled against the sins, both individual and national that are there spread out with so much gruesome detail. One of the latest books on Old Testament history vigorously condemns and practically excommunicates from the roll of the saints some of the characters who have in the past occupied honorable places. Even

the actions of Jehovah himself, in commanding the extermination of the Canaanites, and the slaughtor of the Amalekites are characterized in the famous lectures delivered in royal audience in Berlin within the past three years, as savagery and butchery of an incredible and uncompromising kind. The presence in the Old Testament of many chapters, hundreds of expressions, figures, and facts, that ill-become the modesty of this age, have given occasion for many bitter condemnations of the Bible.

On the other hand, there is another class of readers and students of the Old Testament, whose unswerving belief in the wisdom and truth of its every act and utterance, feels called upon to defend it. In their attempt to justify and vindicate the language and the characters of the Bible, they usually employ such arguments and methods as rather confuse than aid the man or woman who is seeking the truth. A practical example: A few years ago I heard one of the most eloquent preachers in this land publicly declare with solemn emphasis, that the so-called immodest language of the Bible was intended by God only for private reading, and therefore forms no objection whatever. Whence did he obtain such information?

Again, some of our most zealous defenders of God's Word seem to think that they are required to justify the words and deeds of Old Testament characters on the basis of New Testament standards of right; and in the process, they slip down themselves, and thus display their own lack of footing. For example, when Abraham went down to Egypt, and told Pharaoh, to save his own life, that Sarah was his sister, he was justified on the ground that she was his half-sister. Justified! Only half a lie, then! But moral confusion of such a defense stirred up in the mind of the listener is worse by far than the original act of Abraham.

We have no right to require of Old Testament characters that they should be measured by the moral standards of the New Testament, and every attempt to compel them to do it results not only in a perversion of the

facts, but in a confusion of moral standards in the minds of our listeners, that can result only in harm to the cause of Christianity.

These various views and methods of explaining the so-called moral difficulties of the Old Testament, have resulted in sore confusion in the minds of some earnest students. They have led some either to shatter, or make complete shipwreck of their faith and to reject the Bible *in toto*. Others have set up their own standards of judgment, and by means of these, accept or reject the biblical books and doctrines. In fact, the chief fault found with the Bible in the past, and I might say in the present, has been not because of its moral and religious claims upon the individual, but because of its pictures of the immoral and irreligious men and women of Bible times. In other words, the Bible has been and is largely judged, not by its rules of conduct, but by its living examples or supposed embodiments of those rules. Such a standard of judgment is both natural and justifiable. We all admire the sublime and beautiful precepts and ethics of Buddhism, Brahmanism, and Confucianism, even though moral conduct is not required by any of them. They are inspiring and elevating and ennobling. But our judgment of the real value of either of these faiths, is based, not on the exquisite literary form or statement of their sacred books, but on the results seen in the lives and characters of the peoples and nations where these faiths hold sway. We must grant the justness of the contention of the man who finds difficulties in the Old Testament and must seek in a helpful and rational maner to dissolve his doubts. For these questions, these moral precipitates of those times, are not insoluble.

It is not my purpose to discuss the entire moral code of the Old Testament, nor to answer the avalanche of questions that deals with its application. I shall rather confine myself to a consideration of the basis of the phases of conduct that we find scattered through the Old

Testament and shall take up a few examples by way of illustration.

1. Recent discoveries in the ancient oriental world have lifted the clouds from our sky, and let in some of the sunlight of God's day. Shining through the prism of modern scholarship this light has been broken into its different colors, so that we are enabled to distinguish between the different shades of thought and truth, and further to explain more fully their proper relations to each other.

To be more specific, the Hebrew people, as we have seen, were a part of the ancient Oriental world. They were only a small folk living in the midst of an active, aggressive body of great nations, such as the Egyptians, the Babylonians-Assyrians, the Hittites, and the Phœnicians. They were an integral part of that civilization that had its home on the East coast of the Mediterranean Sea. Its own neighbors and associates were the Canaanites, the Moabites, the Edomites, the Ammonites, the Philistines, and the Syrians or Aramæans. Recent discoveries on the soil of the territory occupied by several of these ancient peoples, and the records of the Old Testament give us a fairly true picture of the moral as well as political conditions that were prevalent among them. Their proximity to them, their substantial oneness of language, their commercial relations, their common modes of life, made them in these respects, at least, sympathetic and helpful to each other. Such points in common led to intermarriages, and all that that implies. The moral standards, and the religious obligations, of each individual people could not, under these conditions, long remain isolated. Custom and conduct are too closely intermingled and inter-related to allow of any violent or even gentle rending asunder. Israel then as a people became entangled in all that characterized the peoples on the East coast of the Mediterranean Sea.

But some one may ask, Were they not the people of Jehovah, and as such under his guidance? Certainly; and they were also people of those times. Right here we

must make an essential distinction. Doubtless, God chose Abraham, revealed himself to him, made a covenant with him, and made him the progenitor of the Hebrew peoples. To the leaders and the prophets, God spoke in diverse manners and in diverse places. The best classes of Israel knew Jehovah, and served him in their way, not in any one period, but in all periods of their history in the Old Testament. My contention carries with it the thought that Israel in its leaders knew God, and maintained the highest form of worship known to the world. Furthermore, I affirm that for all such Israelites their conception of God was the ruling idea of life. Morality for them was what God commanded, and immorality was what he forbade. To the pious Israelite, God was the basis and the sanction of moral law.

Nevertheless, the nation as a nation, and the leaders as leaders, were not immune to their environment. To make them so would be to regard them as unhuman, as demigods, and thus characters with whom we could not deal or sympathize. They were an integral part of the life of their times, and in all our discussion, this fact must be reckoned with.

2. Any detailed and full discussion of the ethics of the Old Testament will embody answers to two questions: (1) What did God command? (2) What did God prohibit? To answer these in full would be to set forth the complete provisions of the law, affirmative and negative. Furthermore, such answer would be a true presentation of the methods by which Jehovah sought to lift up, elevate, and train Israel in the paths that he desired they should walk. In other words, if such a full and complete code of laws could be made we should no longer be in doubt as to the divine programme for the separation, the elevation, and perfection of a people after his own heart.

But unfortunately, we cannot do this thing. No two schools of Bible students or scholars agree. But on one point there is harmony. All agree that God took Israel as he found her, among, and mingled with, the peoples of

her time, saturated by the social and moral ideas of those times. By gentle steps, and gradual rises, sometimes scarcely perceptible, he led her up out of the total degradation of her neighbors, to appreciate in some small degree higher and better things. He gave her laws only as she could comprehend them, and such laws as would not violently break down the most deep-seated customs of the day. Prohibitions seem to have been the most favorite form of early law, revealing the fact that the conduct of Israel was such that improvement must be made by a series of eliminations. Of the ten commandments, eight are prohibitions, one a command with an implied penalty attaching to its violation, and followed by a prohibition. Now those so-called ten commandments or words cover the moral action of Israel as required by God. Several of these prohibitions had been made prior to the giving of the law at Sinai, but are here first concisely and specifically laid down.

Soon after the flood there was established between God and Abraham covenant relations, symbolic of intercourse between them. This covenant carried with it certain obligations of obedience and loyalty to Jehovah. Such obedience implied an abandonment of certain popularly recognized local customs, and rules of conduct. Murder had been prohibited just after the flood; and the sin of Sodom had been condemned by the judgment of God. But the ten prohibitions as they should be more justly termed did not cover the whole category of sins. They required man to worship the one true God reverently, to honor the Sabbath and his parents, and to have due regard to the family and property rights of his fellow-man. Interpreted merely from an external point of view, these would strike at the heart of many of the most flagrant violations of divine and human law current among the nations who were Israel's neighbors. But the immorality and the wrongs that were permitted, aside from those which were openly and secretly violated, are to some the disturbing factors in the problems before us. We are to keep per-

petually in mind, the fact that the *morale* of every nation about Israel, and of the mass of Israel itself, was of a low, degraded order, that they were swayed by their passions as the sea is by the winds, that they had slight stability, and less resistance to outbursts of anger, violence, and bloodshed. Furthermore, the commands and pronouncements of God secured their enforcement almost entirely by the bonds of the convenant, or the fear of a penalty. Such being the case, it is plainly evident that the authority of the law alone made but slight gains until a class of men arose whose mission it was to speak for God.

Let us now look at some of the sins which were prevalent but were not prohibited by law. Polygamy appears before the flood (Lamech), and is prevalent during all of Israel's pre-exile history. We find it in the families of Abraham, Jacob, Esau, Gideon, David, Solomon, Rehoboam, and Josiah. Oriental tribal leaders, rulers, landed-proprietors, and kings, in all the nations about Israel, in Egypt, Babylon, Elam and Persia were of one mind, in the perpetuation of this ancient custom. The only limit that seems to have curbed it was the shortage of resources for the maintenance of so expensive a household.

The prevalence of polygamy led to the extension and multiplication of a whole list of horrible social evils, that threatened the very existence of some of the peoples of that day. Priests, prophets, and reformers cried out against them as the bane of civilization. The seventh commandment touches only one of these sins.

Lying was recognized as a legitimate method of acquiring the ends sought after—the end justified the means—and was indulged in by king and peasant. Deception, a lie's half-sister, not simply in war, but in peace, and everywhere was regarded as both right and honorable, provided one was not caught in the act. Abraham and Jacob succeeded in winning their cases, and hence by Oriental codes of ethics were in the right—nor, indeed, by their interpretation did they break any of the prohibitions

of the ten commandments. "Thou shalt not kill," was doubtless intended to be a curb on the prevalence of blood-revenge. If a man intentionally or accidentally killed another, it was the duty of the nearest kinsman or of the tribe of the slain to slay the murderer. This custom became so destructive, that often almost entire tribes were, as they are to-day, in the Orient, wiped off the map. The statement of the sixth commandment is explicit, but was not effective in checking the scourge of blood revenge. The selection of six cities of refuge located in different parts of the land, was intended as an appendix to the sixth commandment. To these the unintentional slayer could flee and after trial and proof of his accidental murder, could remain in security until after the death of the high-priest.

But the violations of this law, with few exceptions, were almost as common in Israel as among their neighbors. Human life was of little account, as we see in the many bloody conflicts both of individuals and of nations. Wars of extermination both of families and of peoples were the order of the day, and some of them, too, for trivial offenses. Such was the unwritten law of the nations, against which the written law of Jehovah was almost powerless. To say that the sixth commandment meant, "Thou shalt not kill without good reason," does not explain the constant violations of it that fill the pages of the Old Testament.

Besides the decalogue Israel had laws touching assaults, treatment of slaves, relations of parents and children, idol-worship and magic, property lost, strayed, or stolen, the poor, unjust judges, etc. These provisions put checks on the current customs of the times, and thus gradually set Israel apart as a people of God's own choice.

While all this may be truly said, it is, at the same time, a fact, that quite all of these regulations just noted were codified and enforced 1,000 years before Moses' day by that master warrior and ruler, Hammurabi, in the valley

of the Euphrates and Tigris rivers. The common law of the great nations was also being enforced among the smaller and less completely organized governments.

The specifications against uncleanness in person and in foods, the provisions for sins of ignorance and other delinquencies point to a system of sacrifices that did much to maintain the moral tone of the law. Beneath and permeating every sacrificial provision, and every ritual requirement, is the holiness of Jehovah.

The legal provisions of Deuteronomy emphasize some things hitherto implied. Justice between man and man, through the medium of impartial and God-fearing judges, attains new importance. The moral character of Jehovah is brought out into a new light, thus impressing upon Israel the desirability of remaining true to one who is so faithful and long suffering toward his own people, and the stranger. The whole book looks at the religious progress of the nation, rather than at the observances of the ritual.

The historical books are marvelously lacking in references to the law or to its enforcement. They show us a people who were gradually rising through a tribal to a unified national existence. Many examples might be cited of the moral obliquity of the actors, to show that Israel was as yet barely rising above the environment of her neighbors. Jael's treachery within the confines of her own tent, and the poet's praise of her, underscore all that has been said of Israel's *morale* in the early years of her history.

As we pass now to the prophetic and poetic utterances, we encounter a new force. The prophet supplemented the ten commandments; he wrought for the ethical evolution of Israel. Ritual and sacrifice became to him of secondary importance. The nation and man should come into direct relation with God. Mere sacrifices were valueless. Their efficacy was positively conditional on the attitude of the offerer. The moral law must be kept in all

its details, and violation of it would be followed by condign punishment.

The strongest representation of Israel's relation to Jehovah is that of a wife to her husband. In each of the great prophets, and particularly in Hosea, this relationship is set forth with tenderness and pathos. The prophet was the moral arbiter of the times. He condemned the numberless and nameless evils that were sapping the nation's power. So far as we can measure, he introduced few new moral ideas, but rather gave his strength to the widest application of the those already current in Israel.

The underlying idea of law, the holiness of Jehovah, became his fundamental text. Purity of life, of worship, and of ritual, and in this order, were his cry. Only such as embodied these virtues were immune from the judgments of Jehovah. Such a doctrine repeatedly and persistently emphasized, passed from the nation to the individual as the one and only one directly responsible for his own acts. But the righteous person's righteousness could not be imparted to another, nor could it be efficient in averting any punishment of which another was guilty. Actual things done were the measure of a man's responsibility. Nevertheless, man's responsibility reached beyond himself, and his good or his evil acts were far-reaching.

The prophets penetrated the shams of their day with divine insight and wisdom. They openly condemned kings, princes, and priests for their commercializing methods of worship. Sacifices should not be perverted for private gain (Saul), nor the moral law violated for purely personal and selfish ends (Ahab and Manasseh). One who could not appreciate Jehovah directly, could not reach him through a sacrifice, for it was the heart, and not the act that determined the man's character in the presence of God.

The Psalms are the moralist's treasure-house. Underneath the poet's exuberant and buoyant faith in God we discover the highest respect for divine law, and its

application in his daily life. Every event of his day, every fact of history is based on his supreme regard for law, and the transcendent moral character of the law-giver. With fiery wrath and burning indignation, he heaps his imprecations upon the wicked, and can find no punishment for them too cruel, or too well-deserved. His humanity, his enmity for the enemies of God, combine to give us writings that are but a natural outburst of his sense of justice.

The Book of Proverbs is a collection of ethical precepts. It is built on the desirability of living a moral life. Its motive seems to have been wholly utilitarian. "Be" and "do right" for that is the road to success. "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge." "Honor Jehovah with thy substance, and with the first-fruits of thy increase; so shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy vats shall overflow with new wine" (3: 9, 10). "Fear Jehovah and depart from evil: It will be health to thy navel, and marrow to thy bones" (3: 7, 8). The two ever-present characters of Proverbs are the Wise Man and the Fool, compared and contrasted until we can faithfully sketch each one of them. They are the personfications respectively of a law-abiding, and of a reprobate life.

"Why do the righteous suffer?" is the question of the book of Job, unanswered and still unanswerable.

The pessimist of Ecclesiastes, having exhausted all the means at hand for the gratification of his desires falls back on the simple truth, "fear God and keep his commandments for this is the whole of man" (Eccl. 12:13).

Having now briefly scanned some of the main features of Old Testament morality, let us take a general view of the case.

We have seen that the Hebrews were steeped in the customs and manners of their times; that they were so wedded to the traditions and the life of their day, that it needed more than man-power to lift them. God's choice of one man and his immediate descendants as the vehicles

of his truth, put the first check on a headlong rush towards destruction and extinction. A code of ten prohibitions, enjoined on his covenant people, formed the nucleus of a new ethical code. This nucleus, by a process of elimination, prohibited many of those acts of men that had been for centuries the cause of the degradation of worship and the disintegration of social life. Besides reverence for Jehovah as the *one* God, and regard for the property of their fellow men, there were special laws on the duties of man to himself, to his fellow-man, to the animal creation, to the soil, and to nature itself. Every such restriction on conduct was a step in advance, and gradually widened and enlarged the moral horizon of the man who was obedient to the God who was the basis of all moral law.

The coming of the prophets introduces to us a class of men whose life-work was the condemnation of every violation of high ethical standards, and the enforcement of the just claims of the moral law. Their conception of right was grounded in the holiness of Jehovah, and no sacrifice was adequate to secure his approval that did not carry with it a penitent heart. The poets of Israel built their productions on moral standards that far eclipse anything found in the literatures of their antecedents or contemporaries. In short, the ethical standards of Israel were based on the moral character of Jehovah as revealed in the successive laws, prohibitions, commands, and regulations entrusted to the prophets, priests and reformers through a long period of years, as over against those of contemporary peoples, which were based either on the caprice of the gods or the decisions of a ruler.

3. With this bird's-eye view of the ethical character of the Old Testament what can be said of its so-called moral difficulties? We have seen that the method of revelation was gradual and disciplinary, and that the purpose of the law was pedagogical; that it was enjoined and enforced only as fast and as far as the elementary minds of the age could apprehend and appreciate it. Such a

method of procedure permitted, rather did not prohibit, at first many things that do violence to our ideas of right. The so-called moral difficulties, rather immoral acts, of the Old Testament, where they are neither prohibited nor rebuked, are simply to be regarded as moral defects of the age, requiring neither justification nor vindication on our part. Our New Testament standards tell us what those sins were, but do not ask that we palliate or excuse them, or attempt to explain them on any artificial hypothesis of the inviolability of Holy Scriptures.

When Jehovah commanded the extinction of the Canaanites, or Saul's slaughter of the Amalekites, he was doing nothing more than to allow the natural hatred and the blood revenge of the peoples of that day to have full sway. There was no cold blooded, unprovoked move on God's part. In the same spirit, he uses the Assyrian as the rod of his anger to punish wayward Judah (Isa. 10:5), and the Babylonians to punish all the earth.

The moral character of Jehovah, here as elsewhere, in the Old Testament, was displayed in its disciplinary, pedagogical acts, based on a high motive in the training of the race.

When Gideon had routed the Midianites, he captured two of the leaders, Zebah and Zalmunna. On learning that they had slain his own brethren at some earlier time, he, in accordance with the requirements of blood-revenge, slew them, his own captives, in cold blood.

Samuel took a sword and hewed Agag to pieces in the presence of Saul and the people—from our point of view a bloody, inexcusable crime. But Agag was the Amalekite king whom Saul had brought home as a trophy of victory, when he had been commanded to destroy the entire tribe. Samuel was simply concluding with his own hand the orders that had been given to Saul to slay all the devoted or banned living beings.

In David's last charge to Solomon, he includes the slaying of Joab and Shimei. This has been called a cowardly, savage order, that greatly discredits the great

king's character. But regard for the safety of an Oriental monarch and his throne required that all rivals and dangerous men in authority should be dispatched. This fact, with some purely human and thoroughly Oriental spirit of revenge, sufficiently account for David's orders.

These are some of the illustrations, of the scores found in the Old Testament, of difficulties that practically vanish when put under the light of ancient Oriental ethical codes.

Before I conclude I wish to revert to one fact mentioned in the beginning of this lecture. From choice, I should pass it over in silence but loyalty to my theme and to the Bible requires that I speak plainly. The immodest and immoral facts described in the Old Testament are merely a shadow of what we find in the literatures of the times of the ancient Hebrews. Perhaps we may not be aware of it, but many of our Latin and Greek text-books in use in our schools to-day are expurgated editions. The *morale* of Old Testament literature even as we find it has given ground for valid objections to the public use of certain portions of it. I am sure that a judicious and careful up-to-date translation could tone down and practically nullify the bold statements of some of these passages—which the Authorized Version and even the American Standard Revised Version render inexcusably objectionable.

But we must remember that the records of the Old Testament were written by, and for peoples, who lived from 3000 to 2000 years ago; and that for them and in their times, the bold and crass statements of the evils of social life were entirely admissible and proper, and, doubtless, in their methods of presentation, served to emphasize with telling power, certain phases of truth. But happily that age has gone by, and we stand on higher levels, with our standards of propriety based on New Testament models, and the evolution from these models of the best that modern Christianity and Christian society demands.

What shall we say then of these old records that em-

body such objectionable material? They are wholly archaic; they represent an age long ago left in the rear, no longer to be condoned, excused, or to be used, except as relics of a *morale* that should be forgotten, and forgotten, the sooner, the better.

I have sincere sympathy for the man or woman, who, with a high and noble sense of moral purity of thought, and principle, objects to the promiscuous reading of the Old Testament by the children of the family. But ought we to retain in our Bible things that not only raise violent objection to it on moral grounds, but actually militate against the best interests of the growth of the Christian religion? Who can answer? Should we expurgate every such moral taint and thus put them all beyond the reach of doing harm? Or, can we from now on, positively, absolutely and everywhere emphasize the truth that every such chapter, verse, or figure is but a relic of a degraded *morale* of a far-off age, that deserves perpetual oblivion?

In this rapid survey of my theme I have endeavored to set forth three points. (1) That Israel was one of the peoples of the ancient Oriental world, possessing almost every element of character in common with her neighbors; (2) That laws of prohibition and command were issued by Jehovah gradually, only as they could be apprehended and applied; and (3) That the moral obliquities of the Israelites, which stand out so conspicuously in the Old Testament, are to be regarded simply as relics of the emergence of a people from comparative barbarism to the better moral standards laid down in the laws of Jehovah, and later in the New Testament.

With infinite wisdom, skill, patience, long suffering, and tenderness, Jehovah selected, trained, disciplined, and refined as in a furnace, an ancient race, a degraded race, a stubborn and recalcitrant race, that thereby he might have a vehicle for his truth, a nation for his name, and a people who could preserve and perpetuate his revelations for future generations and for time immemorial.

THE SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPT.

BY PROF. FREDERICK W. MOORE, VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY.

The idea which we express by the signs "social" and "society" is common to all peoples and all languages; is older than literature and is found in the most ancient traditions. But the expression "social science" has a meaning which is modern and specific; and it deserves careful and serious attention. We owe the suggestion to August Comte, a famous French scholar, who just before the middle of the nineteenth century undertook to write a comprehensive system of "Positive Philosophy." He proposed to classify knowledge into five sciences: mathematics, astronomy, physics, chemistry and biology in order. In his day all of these were recognized as he arranged them and the phenomena assigned to them respectively had been subjected to the positive or scientific method of treatment. But Comte further observed a large and important mass of phenomena arising out of the relations of man with man in society which could not be classified in any of the five sciences which he had recognized. These he grouped together under the designation of social phenomena and asserted that they too must be subjected to the positive method of treatment, proposing to call the resulting body of knowledge sociology and ranking it in his system sixth and last in order of complexity.

In the next generation the German political scientist Schaeffle and the English philosopher Herbert Spencer not only treated social phenomena by the positive method but declared society to be an organism. Though as a working hypothesis this theory did not fully accord with the facts, yet there seemed to be some degree of truth in it. Sociologists are not satisfied to cast it aside altogether. Some limit themselves to saying cautiously that

society is organic, like an organism, having essential resemblances to an organism. Others would take the suggestion of Lester F. Ward that if we are to rely upon the analogy between society and an organism we must seek the analogous organism among the lowest biological orders, among the protozooa for instance, where the brain and other important functioning organs are not differentiated and localized in one part of the body, as in higher organisms, but are diffused. Thus the brain is localized in man but not in society. We may not permit ourselves to say as Spencer did that the brain of society is represented by the governing or regulating body. This statement may seem to be rather plausible when applied to a despotic monarchy. But it is plain, even to the cursory observer, that it gives a very inadequate characterization of the real directive agency in a modern popular government where the dependence of elected representative officers upon their constituents is obvious and notorious and a matter of fundamental principle.

But however close or remote the analogy between society and an organism, sociologists are agreed in recognizing an important and comprehensive class of phenomena in which the essential unit is not the individual but the group, in which the group unit, as such, shows growth, increasing complexity, differentiation of function and organ, adaptation to environment, degeneration under adverse conditions, and development and progress under favorable conditions. The individual may have his part in making the group what it is. But it is a fact equally conspicuous that the group has its part in making the individual what he is; and that what it makes of him is even incidental to what it is and is becoming. The individualist, representative of the philosophy of a century ago, studied the individual as such. The individual, made in God's likeness, was to him the supreme, the sublimest entity. The sociologist is by definition a student of society, of the group, and only incidentally of the individual as contributing to or as affected by it. Hence the socio-

logical concept, the working hypothesis of the sociologist, is that there are entities which are composed of individuals in some organic relation. The number of individuals in the various social entities may be larger or smaller; the organization may be more or less perfect. The same individual may be a member of more than one of these groups at the same time. Yet even so each entity has its nature and being, its end and purpose, and its modes of behavior apart from other groups and from the individuals which compose it, a nature and being which are the proper subjects of study by observation, experiment, and induction.

It is a proposition which almost states itself that the immediate end of sociology must be the development of the group entity, be it class, caste, community, state, or race. But it does not follow that this development is to be considered an end in itself. Is it not rather to be treated as a means to the higher development of the individuals into which the group must at last be analyzed? Is it not perhaps true that the individualist of old dropped a link in his chain of reasoning and neglected a factor both helpful and necessary in perfecting the individual? Is it not the mission of the sociologist to show that the highest type of individuality is to be found in the individual who is himself the product of the most highly developed group? If indeed this is the ultimate end to which the sociologist may conduct us the mind can scarcely comprehend the vastness, the grandeur, and the sublimity of his task and opportunity.

In the first place, this sociological concept, with all its dreamed of possibilities, is at least entitled to the toleration which is universally accorded to a working hypothesis in positive science. So long as the rule is new or has not been frequently tried or is thought to be based upon too narrow or uncertain a range of facts or observations to deserve complete confidence and dependence it may be called a working hypothesis and the experimenter will have a double interest in applying it. If by its aid he is

able to explain the facts which he has observed he will place confidence in the explanation and increase his reliance upon the hypothesis. This is the situation with the sociological hypothesis. It must still be tested as it is applied. Time and experience will undoubtedly give us some important corrections as they will most certainly give us many additional facts and laws based upon the facts.

Secondly and specifically, the sociological theory deserves consideration because it furnishes a very satisfactory test of the older theories, confirming some of them and making apparent the weakness of others, offering at the same time a more satisfactory solution of the problem in hand. One instance of the latter sort is the theory of paternalism in government, which has given way to the theory of an individualistic society; and now both have yielded place through weakness in certain points to the sociological. The paternalistic theory imputed to the head of the state a function that was fatherly. One of the most conspicious exponents of it was Frederick the Great, of Prussia. He in his time epitomized the essential philosophy of it in the figure by which he sought to characterize and magnify his royal function when he called himself the "first servant" of his people, the one who was accountable before the world and before God for their welfare, the one whose office and responsibility it was to care for them. This he did with a degree of officiousness in political, economic, and social matters that gave him the title of the "benevolent despot."

Before the end of the eighteenth century this theory of government was found to be leading monarchs and statesmen to indulge in the public regulation of affairs to a degree that people began to resent as undue and harmful interference with the liberty of the subject, especially in economic matters. So a revolution was worked out both in philosophy and in the practices of government.

This revolt led to the promulgation of the theory of in-

dividualism. As a political and economic doctrine it is negative. It is the doctrine later formulated by Jefferson that the people best governed is the people least governed, that the government should busy itself about the fewest things possible. Some things were by long experience and common consent admitted to belong to the government, which because of them had a reason for existence. But the other things were best done when the government left them alone; when they were left to each individual and to each community to attend to as private and local interests dictated. Adam Smith developed it into a system of political economy that first helped to change and then came to express the economic ideas of the generation which succeeded him. Moreover he and his disciples elaborated it into a system of philosophy making selfishness, the self-interest of the individual, its corner stone. It assumes that a man can rightly discern and successfully achieve his own best interests if he will; if he does not the fault is his own. Again a man rightly discerning and rightly achieving his own best interests cannot harm his fellows if he would but must promote their interests whether he would or not. It is therefore his policy to seek to know his own interests intelligently and to follow them faithfully; thus will he best serve himself, his generation, and mankind.

The new theory of individualism grew apace and seemed to be vindicated by changes in industrial life. But scarcely had the first quarter of the nineteenth century passed before the validity of this working hypothesis was challenged by alarming facts that were all too pitiful and patent. Men became conscious of the fact that the property holding classes of England, especially the factory and mine owning classes of England whom the revolutionized processes of industry had raised to a prominence which they had not before had, persisted in seeking their selfish interests at the expense and to the hurt of the very life energy of the working classes; and that the latter, however clearly they might see their own interests, could

but see also how hopelessly unable they were to protect themselves. Society must take heed; the government did come to their aid. But first the rising spirit of democracy had to force the great reform bill through a privileged Parliament. Then there came into the new House of Commons the representatives—not of the lower radical classes—but of the sturdy middle class of English manhood who did not hesitate to insist that the government should lay its hands upon the abuses and correct them. So factory acts were passed regulating the number of hours which employers might require women and children to labor in their factories. Mine acts were passed forbidding the employment of women and children under ground and limiting the ages and hours of work of those employed above ground. Acts were passed protecting the poor little chimney sweeps. The Earl of Shaftesbury, the seventh of an illustrious line, was a pioneer in securing these reforms. He ranks as one of the great reformers of the nineteenth century; and it is incredible to us that in the second quarter of that century he should still have had to struggle so hard and even to endure the disdain of his peers before he could get a hearing for matters that are to-day the commonplace of philanthropy. We are now taught that we are our brothers' keepers. We are warned that we must be held responsible for much of their condition. We are shown that man is not an independent self-sufficient unit, a law and an end unto himself, who can be left to follow his own desires and use his opportunities without restraint. It appears that he cannot control his own desires within the limits necessary if the degree of welfare which we concede as a right to others is to be respected. If his opportunities are great he will use them to abuse others. If they are too few they do not suffice him to protect himself. He either needs restraint or protection. He cannot be left entirely free. We are taught to observe that he is a member of a group which must restrain him, protect him, and direct him.

Thirdly, not only negatively—as eliminating unten-

able theories—but positively—as gathering up and interpreting the theories which have stood the test of time and have long enjoyed public approval—does the new sociological hypothesis concerning the character and nature of the group command consideration. In the light of the new hypothesis the state is but the people politically organized seeking through the agency of government to procure those ends which may be best achieved in this way. But it is a question to be discussed in political theory and practical statecraft what ends it is proper for peoples to procure through their political organization and what governmental forms are best suited to certain ends and conditions. From the sociologist's point of view it would seem that political organizations are not all comprehensive nor are governments all powerful. But the theory long so dear to Americans and to Baptists, the separation of state and church, is founded in the very nature of things. We now realize that it is not best for state or church, good government or spiritual religion, to try to promote religious interests and political interests by one and the same compulsory organization.

Still another theory rescued from the wreck of old economic doctrines presents in the new light of modern social science such a broad, expanding, elevating, ennobling conception of man's highest wants that it deserves to be treated separately as a fourth co-ordinate reason for giving consideration to the working hypothesis of the sociologist.

The Ricardian theory of economics laid the stress on production. It was a question of making the greatest product at the least cost, of selling it at the highest price, and of netting the greatest gain to the producer. But the modern school looks at the matter in a different light. It puts human happiness as the great end, not the producer's gain. According to the conceptions cherished by the members of this school man does not simply live to work; he works to live, and to live more abundantly. Man is conceived to be a being with wants which are ex-

pansible. The want or desire for a good of any given kind, granted the means with which to obtain it, will grow. But the quantitative increase of any particular want is the least important part of the expansion, for in fact it is very limited. Of bread one soon gets enough. Money is accounted the only material good of which everybody always wants more than he has. New wants will arise and human wants should not only increase in variety but should also improve in quality.

As they are not all to be accounted of the same worth what should be accepted as the standard of valuation? Shall it be a physical standard; that of the athlete? An intellectual standard; that of the scholar? A moral standard? Above and beyond all these is there not a spiritual standard? If God created us in his own spiritual likeness shall we presume to ignore the significance of that fact, making no provision for the cultivation of the spiritual side of our nature, the development of our spiritual wants? It is indeed unquestionably a matter of ethical and spiritual moment which of our wants are developed. The *laissez-faire* theory would let it alone and leave every individual to his own unguided, self-determined inclinations. But it is very plain that people are not so left. They are environed with civil, moral, and social laws. Under the uncontrolled operation of the struggle for existence the fittest to survive might be the lowest morally; fist-right overmastering moral right. But that we will not consent to allow. We are our brothers' keepers, theoretically, actually, positively. We defend them and we constrain them, also, in the way they should go.

Now who should be most concerned regarding the proper oversight over these matters? Can the high-minded consent to abdicate in favor of those of lower ideals? Will not the Christian positively assert and confidently maintain that the Christian ideals include all that is best in the other ideals of health, of intellectual vigor and activity, of culture, of art, of civilization, of morals—and the religious and spiritual ideals beside, striving to

realize them in social and in individual thought and rule and practice? But to such an end no theory of life could be more favorable than this of the modern economists. It calls upon us to conceive and to plan the noblest things for the individual and to devise the wisest means for their realization, through the agency of social forces among others.

So then, fifthly, the working hypothesis of the social scientist commands our acceptance as Christians because it predicates an end, a goal, an aspiration to human development.

In studying the history of social groups to discover the law of their formation and development Ward has been led to the discovery of two classes of forces in operation: the genetic and the teleological. "The difference between telesis and biological genesis may be expressd by saying that under genetic processes the subject has to yield to environment. Only those specimens live which are fitted to survive or are plastic enough to become adapted to the environment. But telic man changes the environment and adapts it to himself; as when a man by the aid of fire and clothing overcomes the rigors of a harsh climate. This distinction which is easy to make and illustrate in the case of the individual also applies to society. Some of the progress of society may be genetic; how much is undetermined. But the rest is planned and purposed by society itself through its governing agency. Some social progress is clearly telic."* Now Ward is an avowed materialist and will trace genetic progress no further back than to the unconscious force of environment and the telic progress no further than to intuition. But I apprehend no difficulty in the way of the Christian theist, with his belief in God, accepting the classification of Ward for he will simply refer both environment and intuition back to God as their author. In the Christian philosophy of life man is something more than a material

*Page 721, "Political Economy, Political Science, and Sociology," University Association, Chicago, 1899-1900. Cf. Ward's Outlines of Sociology. pp. 182 ff.

or even a merely conscious, reasoning being. Neither his physical nor his intellectual nature nor both together comprise his whole being. There is a spiritual part to his nature. He has an immortal soul and there is an element of the divine in him that has been developed some; but perhaps, nay shall we not certainly believe, is capable of vastly more than he has yet attained or we can now comprehend that it is possible for him to attain. Man has been developing his God-like faculties. Sometimes unconsciously, but sometimes also consciously and with a realization of the end to which he is aspiring he has shaped his course excelsior, excelsior. If we are to live as immortal spirits forever in the presence of God who is Spirit does it not follow that we as Christians must look upon our spiritual faculties as the noblest part of our natures and the development of these faculties as a Christian duty and the goal of all our striving? If this is the end towards which we are tending shall we not make use of every scientific principle that may serve to help us direct our efforts intelligently? To my mind there is no doubt that the study of the telic purpose, the philosophy of history, promotes this sublime end.

Again and sixthly, the sociological working hypothesis commands our favorable consideration because it allows full value and effect to all of the moral and religious agencies through which people have tried to work. It outlines a system in which each one is seen to be a social organ performing its appropriate function more or less successfully, with more or less permanent and ennobling results.

It looks upon society as an aggregate of individuals with many and varied interests, some mutual, some opposed. Those who have opposed interests oppose each other and those whose interests are the same associate to promote their common interests. Each individual is looked upon as a member of more than one of these groups at one and the same time, following out many purposes as intelligently, consistently, effectively as possible. So-

ciologists are studying the process of association and conflict, the nature of groups, the forces that differentiate them, and the functions which they serve. They are not only watching the movements of social groups in contemporaneous society. They are studying also the history of institutions, industrial, political, religious, or of whatsoever other sort they may be, identifying the forces that brought them into existence, discerning the methods of their operation, their adaptation to the ends to be accomplished, and the substitution of better institutions in place of them at the appropriate time.

Property, private property, in goods and in land, is one of the oldest and most general and most universally and highly respected of institutions. Yet we can certainly go back to civilizations in which at least private property in land was not recognized; and it is now a question of serious and pressing importance with scientists who study history and with men who love equity and righteousness whether the existing rights in land and goods are not used in some respects contrary to public welfare. Religion is an institution as old as association itself. It is one of the characteristics of a man that he should want to know his Maker and strive, if ever so crudely, to figure to himself who and what his Maker is that he may fall down before him and worship and propitiate him.

It is entirely unnecessary to demonstrate the importance of Christianity as an institution in the world's history. But it is in point to show how the world is coming to appreciate the fact as never before. It is not so very long ago that secular history was exclusively political, scarcely more than a chronicle of royal acts. Then it became constitutional also in its scope, then industrial, and institutional, with special reference to secular institutions. We have a history of art and a history of literature. It is now beginning to be realized more clearly that ecclesiastical history is not a professional subject for theological schools alone. Historians are coming to treat the mediaeval church as one of the most influential among

the social institutions of the Middle Ages. This period fell heir to the literature and philosophy of Greece and to the law and administrative system of Rome. But incomparably greater than all these was the contribution of Christianity in respect of "the definiteness and confidence of its teachnngs on ..... the immortality of the soul, and the expiation of sin," "the tender fatherhood of God," and the belief "that an intimate personal tie had been established between" the Christian "and God by the Savior."*

Education, charity, and morals are other important classes of public interests which require proper organs or institutions to care for them. In part they are cared for by the state through the agencies of government. To some extent they are cared for by voluntary efforts organized apart from the church. To some extent, at least, they are cared for through ecclesiastical agencies or under ecclesiastical control; and very properly so since the educational, benevolent, and moral ideals of the Christian religion are pitched upon a distinctly higher plane than those of the secular state. The Sunday School and the whole of the recently developed work by and for young people may be classed as specialized religious institutions subordinated to the local church which have made for themselves opportunities to do a work which the churches without them were doing inefficiently or not at all. The Y. M. C. A. is an institution which has been organized on an interdenominational and in international scope. In using these organizations as practical agencies in Christian work it is well not to forget their sociological significance.

Once again and finally, the sociological concept has singularly strong attractions for the Christian because the sublime law of self-sacrifice is common to them both. Can this be a mere co-incidence or is it not rather due to the fact that Christianity is the crowning idea of the

* Mediæval European History, J. H. Robinson, preface. History of Civilization in the Middle Ages, G. B. Adams, pp. 39-64.

sociological system? Sacrifice is the law of life and progress. Except a seed of corn fall into the ground and die it cannot bring forth. And it may not be the weak and criminal and worthless element which is selected for the sacrifice, but the best. It is the sacrifice of the parent for the child, of the patriot for his country, of the nurse and physician for those stricken by epidemic, of the rescuer for those perishing in fire and flood, of the missionary who sacrifices home life and opportunities for life in the foreign fields, on the frontier, or in the city slums; of the only begotten of the father who died that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life, of him who said: "If I be lifted up I will draw all men unto me," and who later prayed: "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do."

The spirit of service permeates the gospel message through and through. "But whosoever would be great among you" let him win the honorable and coveted position by social service; let him "be your minister," "your servant"; therein lies the truest, greatest honor. He that selfishly seeketh after and "findeth his life shall lose it," for it is but as the grass that dieth and counts as nothing when measured by the standards which Jesus sets. "But he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." Here as so often Jesus speaks in hyperboles. He that liveth to himself dieth to all that is most worth living for, his life is already wasted and thrown away. He that dieth for Jesus' sake shall be as one who has lived with honor for he hath done that which it is worth one's while, dying, to have accomplished. Elijah was fed by the ravens; John, the Baptist, lived on locusts and wild honey; Jesus was entertained by his friends; Paul boasted that he had supported himself by his own hands, being chargeable to no one. But who would for an instant suggest a comparison between the wages and the services of these men? It is true that the current economic policy which is relied on to stimulate our industrial life is based on the principle that men will be led to prac-

tice thrift by being guaranteed the benefits of their own thriftiness. It is true also that many men look upon the emoluments and the honors as the principal inducements to entering upon the practice of the law or into public service. But this does not change the fact that in theory the function of the lawyer is to be the servant of the court and that the social function of the judge, the governor, and the legislator is to be the servant of the people. It is a misfortune which we have not yet succeeded in eliminating and which we still suffer from that public services are too often done by those who put a higher estimate upon the personal gain than on the social service.

In another field social service is more clearly recognized as the predominant motive. If social service promotes social progress; if social progress is telic, having the improvement of the race and the development of the individual as its aim; and if the moral and religious ideals of Christianity are the noblest and sublimest which the world knows of or can conceive, what shall we say of the social service of the Christian ministry, of those who are devoted to preaching righteousness and serving their fellow men?

These are the considerations which justify us in giving consideration to the sociologist's working hypothesis that the group is the proper unit of social observation and experiment. Is there anything in it irreconcilable with a Christian's faith in God? There are two things in it: facts and inferences from the facts—which we call, according to their credibility, hypotheses, theories, laws, and principles. As to the facts involved they are what the best trained scientific minds using the best methods of investigation determine them to be. As for the inferences from the facts, if any man believes in God and believes that this universe is his handiwork, built and ordered in harmony with his nature, can he refuse to risk the legitimate inferences from the facts of that universe? It is preposterous. If contradictory inferences are paraded let him show that they are based upon imper-

fectly determined or insufficient facts; and let him do his part in postponing the drawing of inferences until they can be drawn with wisdom and not rashly. If the experience of the past teaches anything on this point, it teaches the need of conservative Christian men in checking rash inferences.

The sociologist's working hypothesis is affording results that are helpful and abundant and that with every step strengthen and confirm our confidence in it. I see no reason why the Christian, be he layman or preacher, should not take it for what it purports to be and handle it as such things ought to be handled, ever watching it critically and testing it as he uses it. Let us commend to him as he sets about his work the conception that the individual in whose immortal soul and eternal welfare he is interested is first of all a unit in a group. Whether he shall be sacrificed to the group that it may progress; or be the victim of its inequities; or profit, if he but will, by what the group has to give him, may not at once appear. But his likes and his dislikes, his limitations and capacities, his fears and his aspirations, will be largely those of the group around him. Moreover our interest is not in the individuals of this generation alone; but in improving the group for the sake of the generations to come. Let us therefore give intelligent consideration to the body of social knowlelge as it accumulates that we may more intelligently deal with the community and the church with which our lot is cast and may more intelligently handle the individuals whom it may be our lot to serve.

THE THEOLOGICAL PROBLEMS AND HISTORICAL PERSONS OF NICAEA.

BY PROF. A. M. FAIRBAIRN, OXFORD UNIVERSITY, ENGLAND.

In the controversy which is named after its great protagonist, Arian, and which broke out in Alexandria in 318 or 319, the deepest theological problems were formulated. The problems were not new; only the sharp and definite terms in which they and the alternative solution were stated. They were essentially involved in the primitive facts and principles of the Christian faith. Their historical source and symbol was the person of Christ; their ultimate object and endeavor was the conception of God. If Christ was what the church believed Him to be, how must God be conceived? If He was not what the church believed him to be, what right had the Christian religion to live and claim the lordship of the whole man? The incarnation was the ultimate fact of faith; the word which was in the beginning with God and was God had become flesh and dwelt among us; the only begotten Son of the Eternal Father had been born of a woman and born under the law. But now if Christ must be conceived as Word and Son, what was His relation to the Father and the Father's to Him? If deity must be ascribed to both, how could God be thought and spoken of as one? Was not the affirmation of more than one divine Person equal to the denial of the divine unity?

These problems which harassed the speculative spirits of the early church were problems the church must either solve or die. For it could not surrender its belief in the deity of Christ without surrendering its right to be and to be believed; and it could not sacrifice its faith in the divine unity without abdicating its place in history and adding another to the many impotent polytheisms of the world. And so many attempts at premature solution

had been made, with no other result than on the one hand to multiply heresies, and, on the other, to show the difficulty of the problem and the necessity of a sufficient solution. Some sought their way to one by emphasizing the divine unity, and substituting a plurality of manifestations for one of persons, God exhibited as creating and maintaining, being named the Father, as suffering and redeeming, the Son, as renewing and sanctifying, the Holy Spirit. God still remained in these different aspects or relations one Person. Hence come the Patripassian and Sabellian heresies, which sought to affirm the divine unity by abolishing all personal distinctions in the Godhead. But thus saving the unity they lost out of the conception of the Godhead all the realities and truths which were creative of the Christian religion, the affections and activities that are possible only as personal relations are real and realized in deity. Others attempted to find a solution through the Person of Christ, either by placing Him as created in subordination to the Father, or by resolving His human personality into a mere form or mask for the divine. Hence came, on the one hand, the various subordination theories both of Alexandrian and Antiochine Fathers, and, on the other, the several types of Doketism, all agreeing in the ascription of a thoroughly unreal or merely apparent humanity to Christ. But these were not so much solutions as the hurried affirmations of impatient and disloyal thought. An unreal divinity or an unreal humanity for Christ meant an unreal Christianity, the translation of its cardinal facts into a series of shows or semblances, or its cardinal truths into a series of finely imagined, but unauthoritative dicta. Without the unity of God and the divinity of Christ the church was but one among many religious societies, not the creation and vehicle of the Absolute Religion.

The period of the controversy was critical, for it was the period when the church passed from proscription and persecution to royal favour and political power. The position was full of danger, for on every side new forces

of good and evil were suddenly evoked and precipitated into the sharpest conflict. The sudden passing from poverty and humble service to opulence and authority was to prove a fateful change to the Christian religion. The men who had grown holy and heroic in the presence of the dungeon and death were now to face the deadlier because more alluring temptations of imperial policies and espiscopal wealth. The emperors, too, though in name Christian were in fact Roman emperors still, conquering and commanding through the cross rather than conquered and commanded by it. They simply changed their religion, were not changed by it. They rather regarded their relation to the new faith through the customs and associations of the old religion than apprehended it with all the duties and possibilities of their position through the words and purpose of Christ. The heathen religions had been affairs of State, determiend in doctrine and ritual worship and order, fast and festival by the imperial will. And what had been was meant to be—the changed religion did not mean a changed authority. Constantine thought he had as much right and ought to have as much liberty to regulate the new as former emperors had had to deal with the old religion. He held himself to be not simply "Imperator," but also "Pontifex Maximus," the supreme spiritual as well as the supreme civil power, able to settle questions of doctrine and discipline like matters of polity or statecraft, by an imperial decree. The consequent danger was immense, the emancipated church, as it seemed, being sorely tempted to be grateful to subservience to its benefactor, and it had not yet learned by bitter experience that the rule of a Christian might be more calamitious to it than the rule of a pagan Cæsar.

The change in the relation of Church to State was soon to raise many new questions, and unhappily, in the worst possible form the church was, as we have seen, divided. The controversy as to the most vital of all matters, the conception, on the one hand, of God, on the other, of the person of Christ, had long agitated all minds, and the

most opposite and sharply antithetical doctrines were now wrestling for a foothold within the church. Two things embittered and lengthened the controversy—the action of the revived heathen philosophy, which at once opposed and imitated Christian theology, and the action of the State, whose interference was most disastrous and depraving, for it attempted to settle the question by outraging the liberties of the church, but succeeded only in turning the highest truths of faith not so much into statutory matters or affairs for civil legislation, as into subjects for court intrigue. Hence the theological confusion became more confounded by the various winds raised by policy and passion. In 323 Constantine. first at Hadrianople then at Chrisopolis, defeated Licinius; in 324 he was undisputed emperor of East and West. But the fierce divisions in the church troubled him, for they seemed to threaten disaster to both religion and the State. He would deal with them as if they were imperial questions; his will would make peace in the church and put an end to the controversy which convulsed it. An imperial letter was issued, rebuking its chief representatives, commanding them to be reconciled, to desist from questions too high for them, to differ quietly as to accidents since they agreed as to essentials. But the imperial voice was unheeded, was hardly heard, indeed, amid the storm. So other means to subdue it were tried; a council was convoked which met on May 20th, 325 at Nicæa.

In this council, Bishops, in number, Eusebius says, over 250, Athanasius, about 300, or more exactly, 318, attended by a multitude of priests, deacons and under-acolytes, assembled at the command and under the presidency of a semi-Christian emperor to decide the subtlest, yet most vital point of faith. Of the 318, the immense majority are utterly forgotten, many are mere names, a few are still known to the historian, and only one or two bear names honored and imperishable. The most famous then are among the least known now. Theodoret says:

"Many were illustrious from apostolic gifts, and many bore in their bodies the marks of Christ." In the crowd we mark Paphnutius, from the upper Thebaid, with ghastly eyesocket, devoutly kissed by the emperor, out of which the eye had been torn in Maximin's (Days) persecution; Patamon, of Heraclea, one-eyed, too, and from the same cause; Paul, of Neocæsarea, with the marks of the red-hot branding irons still on his hands; Spiridion, the shepherd Bishop of Cyprus, said to possess a wonderful gift of miracles, so protected by God that robbers attempting to carry off his sheep were bound in invisible bonds till his prayers released them, so gifted with spiritual sense as to hear his dead daughter speak to him from her tomb. On the other side stood the Arian group, headed by Eusebius, of Nicomedia, a man skilful in courts, potent, or wishful of potency in State affairs, using theological questions as political agencies, agitating craftily, in the diplomatist's way, to have his belief declared the faith of the church. Between the Arians and the orthodox stood Eusebius, of Cæsarea, learned and observant, courtly and garrulous, distrustful of extremes, hateful of fanaticism, wishful to find in the simpler creed of older and soberer times a golden middle way in which all parties might walk, if not in perfect concord, at least in serene good fellowship. But the person at the council manifestly greatest was Constantine, the emperor. He opened it in a speech that praised peace and advised conciliation; and later he showed how peace was to be reached by casting into the fire a sealed packet containing all the complaints which had from the various sides been made to him, saying to the bishops, "You cannot be judged by men; God alone can decide your controversies." "Christ has commanded man to forgive his brother, if he would be forgiven himself." But the matter was not to be so easily settled; compromise was impossible, for even the most suservient there held the honour of Christ greater than the will of Cæsar.

But besides the emperor, who was manifestly great,

other two notable men were there, though neither could boast any espiscopal dignity. The first of these was the man who has given his name to the controversy. Arius was a Libyan by birth, who had been educated at Antioch, and was in 319 a preacher in Alexandria. The cities, Antioch and Alexandria, were theological rivals, their schools alike famous, but in principles and methods most dissimilar. Antioch was critical, devoted to grammatical and historical exegesis, to literal and realistic interpretations; but Alexandria was more imaginative and speculative, loved to find allegories in history, to discover double meanings, outer and inner, carnal and spiritual senses in plain narratives and simple texts. Antioch liked clear definitions, doctrine that could be built into a system that would satisfy the logical understanding, but Alexandria, more lofty of reason, strove after the discovery and articulation of truths faith demanded, though logic might be unable to define or prove. In the third century the most famous teacher in the school of Antioch was Lucien, in the school of Alexandria, Origen. In the former, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nicæa, and Arius were educated; and their doctrinal affinities throughout life show how much they owed to the school. There the idea of subordination reigned; Father and Son were not equal, but subordination was essential to the one, superiority and supremacy to the other. Arius carried these ideas to Alexandria; here another order of thought reigned. Devout minds were looking toward a notion that would, as it were, co-ordinate Father and Son, making each eternal, necessary to the very conception of God. Hence, while Lucien had seized on the ideas of supremacy and subordination implied by the two terms, Origen had speculated as to the process they implied, and had striven to reconcile the plurality of persons with the unity of essence by formulating the idea of Eternal Generation. Now this conflict of mind and thought could not but affect Arius, forcing him either to modify or develop his own ideas. The latter was the way he took, being roused into re-

sistance rather than subdued into harmony by his new conditions. In personal appearance he was tall, severe of aspect, with head covered by a mass of unkempt hair. He was austere in character, yet of agreeable address, ascetic, yet popular, tenacious, persistent, with a disposition his foes thought quarrelsome, but his friends most winsome and steadfast. He was without speculative genius, but of immense logical ability; skilful in dialectic, but deficient in the spiritual vision that ever distinguishes the true divine. His gifts were altogether of the order that could bring the loftiest problems into the region of popular debate, that could find terms for the inexpressible level to the common understanding, coining formulæ that made it in no degree intelligible or known, yet allowed it to become a matter of familiar controversy. The phrases that become the Arian watchword in the conflict were phrases that bore the very image and superscription of his dialectical adriotness and speculative impotence "God was not always Father, but there was a time when He became one." "The Son did not always exist, for He was not before He was begotten." "He is not of the essence of the Father, but as created a creature," "not existing by necessity of nature, or essence, but by the choice or will of God." And Arius adopted the most effective means of making these easily handled and most intelligible formulæ matters of common currency. While without imagination or the faculty and vision of the poet, he yet had enough rhetorical skill to write what seemed poetry to those degenerate days. In his "Thalia," or Banquet, written in the sotadic metre that was so offensive to his devouter opponents, he justified himself and his doctrines. Athanasius has preserved its opening stanzas for us, and there we read how he praised himself as one who had learned from the possessors of wisdom, the well cultured, the divinely taught, and now going along harmoniously with them, he suggested much for the glory of God, learning while he suffered. Besides his "Thalia," he had songs for sailors, millers and way-

farers; and these scattered among all classes, enabled the most ignorant to enjoy the rare privilege of arguing, even while they sang, with the most learned. And so as Socrates brought philosophy down from the clouds; Arius called theological controversy from the schools into the streets. The discussions suited the Alexandrian wits; the people rushed into the fray with a fine sense of their ability for it. Wharfmen and porters, buyers and sellers, serving men and maids held strong debate on generated or ungerenarted being, on the ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας or ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, on the ὁωοουσιον, the ὁωοιουσιον, or the ἀνόωοιον. As Athanasius himself witnesses, the Arian man, anxious to puzzle the orthodox woman, would not, too modestly inquire, "Hast thou a son before thou didst bear? If thou hadst none, how can God have one before He begets?" Or the Arian would demand of the Athansian, "Is there one ungenerated Being? or are there two? How can the Unbegotten and the Begotten be alike eternal and alike necessary in their existence? If the Begotten is one who begins to be, how can He have been from eternity" Gregory of Nyssa has given us a characteristic sketch of the Constantinople of his day, but it describes even more accurately the Alexandria of our period, "every corner, every alley of the city was full of those discussions—the streets, the market-place, the drapers, the money-lenders, the victuallers." Ask a man, (how many oboli?) and he answers by dogmatizing on generated and ungenerated being. Inquire the price of bread, and you are told, (the Son is subordinate to the Father). Ask if the bath is ready, and you are told, (the Son arose out of nothing).

There are two stories as to the origin of the controversy. One makes the Patriarch or Bishop of the city, Alexander, go out of his way in a meeting of his clergy to declare the Son equal in eternity and essence with the Father, which Arius at once and hotly contradicted; the other makes Arius voluntarily assume the offensive against the orthodox faith. Both are probably true: the declaration of Alexander, with the public contradic-

tion, simply the result and recognition of controversies long conducted in private. What followed need not be described. Alexander demanded retraction; Arius refused. Parties were formed; Alexandria cast out the heretic; he went eastward and found friends. Eusebius, of Nicomedia stood forward as his apologist, and Alexander in a circular epistle accused him to the churches. This letter was almost certainly the work not of Alexander, but of Athanasius, the second of the notable men within the council, though he had not yet attained episcopal rank. He was only indeed a deacon and the Patriarch's secretary, but he was destined even more than the emperor to command the storm, and to play for almost fifty years a leading part in the church. He had already proved himself a subtle apologist for the Christian religion and a strenuous critic of heathenism. He was to be a mighty foe of Arius and a victorious champion of orthodoxy, a valiant defender of the liberties of the church and its strong bulwark against the rising tide of imperial tyranny. He lived and contended a much loved and much hated man, the idol and the abhorrence of his own age, and to after years either a saint and a successful exponent of the deepest mysteries of faith, or a dexterous dialectician and furious stickler for the minutest verbal distinctions. He had a soul so noble as to touch even the cold and critical intellect of Gibbon with enthusiasm. The cynical historian, who made merry over "the furious contests which the difference of a single dipthong excited between the Homoousions and the Homoiousions," *could not refuse his admiration to the "immortal name" of the man whose courage and genius made the Homoousions victorious.

The youth of Athanasius lies in the deepest obscurity, the very year of his birth being unknown. It must have happened at the end of the third or beginning of the fourth century. His first work must have appeared dur-

*"Decline and Fall," Chap. xxi.

ing or before 319, and we may well assume that he did not become an author before he was 21. He had recollections, though indistinct as those of a child, of the persecution under Maximian in A. D. 303-5; and so if we make 298 his birth-year, we cannot be far wrong. The only glimpse we have into his boyhood is through a story which shows the boy so like the man that we can hardly tell whether Nature so propheised what was to be or fond fancy imagined what ought to have been. Alexander, the then Patriarch of Alexandria, looking out from a house where he was to dine, once saw a band of boys on the sea-shore playing at a religious service, in which with all the needful and established forms, baptism was administered. Anxious to discover whether it proceeded from reverence or mockery, Alexander called the boys, examined them, found all had been done in proper form and with utmost sobriety of spirit, and was so struck with the boy who had acted the Bishop that he adopted him, and had him educated under his own eye. This boy was Athanasius, and the story represents him as with the qualities he was most to need so built into his nature that they broke out spontaneously in his very play. And he was placed where these qualities were certain to be most completely developed. Alexandria was exactly the city where such a boy could be most thoroughly educated. In no city was life so varied, intellect so active, man so busy, religion at once so strenuously aggressive and so strongly resisted. The people were mobile yet tenacious, nimble and subtle of wit, rich and resourceful in trade, of mixed blood and wide culture. The harbour was crowded with ships that carried the grain and fruits of Egypt to Rome, and bound in intercourse and interests the cities of the Nile and the Tiber. The Jews had an immense colony, a synagogue that was almost a fourth temple, a worship elaborate as the old Judean, and schools where Moses was made to speak in Greek things he had never uttered in Hebrew. Philosophy, too, decayed in Greece had made its home in Alexandria, and

as Neo-Platonism had attempted to become a religion, wearing rags it had borrowed from Plato and Moses, Christ and Buddha into a system as beautiful but as unsubstantial as the rainbow, perhaps all the more beautiful that it was stretched over the dark background of expiring paganism. Though its most creative teachers had passed, it was yet full of vigorous life, and with its ecstacies, visions, mortifications of the flesh, its æons and spiritual hierarchies, its allegorical interpretations, which enabled it to find wonderful wisdom in the most offensive parts of the old mythology, its theistic and even sacramentarian doctrines, it had attracted to it and rallied round it all the noblest hearts and best heads of the dying Faith. The antagonism between Neo-Platonism and Christianity was all the intenser because they faced each other not simply as foes, but, in a sense, as rivals. The gymnasium of the one vied with the catechetical school of the other, and the same persons were often found to be students in both. And the catechetical school had its own fame; within it Clement, Origen and Dionysius had taught, bringing intellects broadened by philosophy to the interpretation of the Christian scriptures and the explication of Christian truth. And within and beneath all this intellectual life there beat a passionate religious zeal. Alexandria had had its martys, among the sternest of their order, and now had its hermits. Antony had sanctified and glorified ascetism. Fiery Copts, sick of heart, weary of the struggle to reconcile a nascent faith with a decadent civilization, had fled from the city to the hermit's cell, and the wonderful colonies of the Thebaid multiplied and flourished while society decayed. And all these influences acted powerfully on Athanasius. He had in the home of the Patriarch the breeding that made him sensitive to the honour and liberties of the church, conscious of her more than royal dignity, of her mission as too high and holy to be forgotten or forsaken at the smile or frown of an emperor. The far-stretching commerce of the city helped to make him cosmopolitan, prevented him

falling into the narrow ways of a provincial ecclesiastic. The philosophical school made him a skilled disputant, exercised not simply in knowledge and by dialectic, but trained through sympathy with men who had struggled towards the truth in the past to speak to the men who were seeking truth in the present. The catechetical school instructed him in the most generous and creative Christianity of the early church, and inspired him by the example of teachers who had been alike victorious in argument and through martyrdom. And the enthusiasm of the cell, the devotion that could forsake the world to save the soul begot in him the spirit of sacrifice, and made him thrill under the hands of Antony as if he had been touched by the finger of God. And his earliest work showed how these varied forces had affected him. The young was a mature man; he came out of the schools with the enthusiasm of the student tempered by the spirit of the Christian. His first work consisted of two treatises, one a discourse against the Greeks, the other "concerning the Incarnation of the Word." They form together a new apology for Christianity, distinguished throughout by one remarkable feature—it was not so much defensive as constructive; it set the Christian religion as a positive and scientific interpretation of Man and his Universe over against the ancient Heathenism. The first treatise started from a strenuous criticism of the Old Polytheism, argues for the higher rationality of Monotheism, and the need alike to God and Man of the Son and Logos. The second continues the argument so as from the history and state of Man to bring out the necessity and significance of the person, death and resurrection of Christ. In this method and aim there was the wisdom of true genius. The best apology for Christianity is its interpretation, to bring out its inmost meaning and set it before the intellect of Man as the articulate truth of God is the best way to commend it to his acceptance. And this is what the treatise of Athanasius did. The time had passed for apologies. Christianity did not now need

to plead, even in the proud words of Tertullian, to be allowed to live; it had proved its right by living to purpose, and turning the very power that persecuted into the power that befriended. What was now needed was to persuade the reason as it had conquered the heart and conscience of man. And so Athanasius planted over against the eclecticism a new philosophy that combined the sublimest elements of all the older systems, a true religion that was also true science, and answered the coarse and disdainful charges of Celsus, and the embittered criticisms of Porphyry, by placing face to face with theirs a system whose centre was the Christ of Nazareth, whose circumference was the infinite God—completer, better reasoned, and more rational than anything that had ever entered the imagination of Plotinus, or been heard in the Neo-Platonic school.

What might have been the issue had no influence turned Athanasius from his path, we cannot tell; yet, indeed, he was never turned from it. His controversy with Arius was a controversy with the fundamental principles of heathenism. The supreme moment of this controversy was the council of Nicaea. The question that there emerged was more soteriological or Christological than teleological. It concerned much more the status of the Son within the Godhead than either the function of the humanity or the relation of the two natures in the Incarnate Christ. What was involved was the predication of necessary existence rather than conditional existence to the Son. It was felt that a being who depended upon anyone's will, even the will of the Father, had, however high he might be placed in the scale of being, a mere contingent existence. He might, or he might not be. A necessity had, therefore, to be claimed for the being of the Son. And this necessity was expressed in the term ὁμωοούσιος, to be the same substance as the Father or to be independant of any will, even the Divine. The term said, in effect, the Son is as essential a constituent of deity as even the Father. Hence, round it raged the

fiercest conflict. The one party objected to it, because it was an unscriptural term, incorrect, heretical, since it had been condemned by an earlier council. Athanasius and his friends argued that no other term could adequtely condemn the new heresy, which said the Son is a creature and made by the will of the Father out of nothing and so affirm the truth that the Son is as necessarily existent as the Father, is eternal, and has from the beginning been in God and with Him. The emperor, who was at first averse to the introduction of anything non-Scriptural into a creed which was to be enforced by statutory enactment, was converted, and ὁμωοούσιος was, therefore, accepted and subscribed as the symbol of the orthodox faith.

Now it would have been altogether agreeable to me, had it been possible, to discuss the meaning of the Nicaean Creed. Picturesque historians of the Eastern church have turned wearily away from the fierce and often ignoble conflict over mysteries too high for human speech concerning terms that denoted things so transcendent as to be without significance for man. But there may be truths in the world the eye that looks for the picturesque fails to see. The struggle at Nicaea was as to whether there should be a Christian God, whether the Christian elements in man's conception of Him should be lost or retained and developed. Beneath the apparent issues the real question was concealed. The Arian formulae that tripped so lightly from the tongue were but as the babbling of a child before the last problem of human reason; and however imperfect the technical terms might be, they represented a far profounder, more reasonable and exalted conception of God. The Arian Deity was a naked and indescribable simplicity, but the Athanasian a manifold active unity. Does God live? Does He love? Is He capable of sustaining relations? These questions now come remote enough from this old Nicaean controversy, but the lay at its very heart. If God lives, His nature must be an eternal activity, infinite

in all its processes and movements; if God is love, He must have ever loved, which means that within His own absolutely perfect essence all the conditions of loving, object as well as subject, are necessarily contained. If God is capable of sustaining relations to the universe, it implies that His being is essentially related being; within Himself, as it were, relations exist, and the absolute God is the God who has never been and can never be out of relation. To express it otherwise—the Arian formulae implied a conception of God that made creation and redemption alike impossible to Him, but Athanasius strove after a conception that would make both not only possible, but, in a sense, necessary. And he in a wonderful degree reached it. The Father who had never been without a Son was in the strictest sense an eternal Father. The Son, who was consubstantial with the Father, represented relations within the Divine Nature, which made God the object as well as the subject of love. The "eternal generation" was the symbol of a process immanent in Deity, the sign of the manifold energies that made God necessarily creator. The God of Arius was abstract, an impossible, immobile, impotent name; the God of Athanasius was concrete, a Being who necessarily lived, loved and created. If Arius had prevailed, the church would have fallen back into a bewildered Pantheism, or an arid Deism. The victory of Anthanasius was the victory of Christian Theism, the only Theism that possesses a living and personal God.

But now let us see how Athanasius lived for the doctrine he had done so much to formulate and maintain. For court favor ever fickle was never so fickle as in the later Empire. Hardly was the council over when Alexander died, and Athanasius was chosen his successor. And we may well believe Gregory of Nazianzus when he describes him as being all that a bishop ought to be, so living as to set an example more persuasive than any eloquence, stooping to common-place minds, yet able to soar high above the more aspiring, accessible

to all, slow to anger, quick in sympathy, pleasant in conversation, still more pleasant in temper, effective alike in discourse and in action, assiduous in his devotions, helpful to Christians of every class and age, a theologian with the speculative, a comforter of the afflicted, a staff to the aged, a guide of the young, a physician to the sick. But he was not to be allowed to exercise his pastoral qualities in peace. Eusebius, the crafty, he of Nicomedia, got to the ear of Constantine, won him, and an imperial mandate was sent to Athanasius—"Restore Arius, or I will depose you." But he refused; where Christ reigned Cæsar could not be allowed to rule. Where force fails, fraud may succeed. Charges of injustice, oppression, continually were carefully framed so as to be most offensive to the emperor, who at length, in 335 commanded Athanasius to appear before a council at Tyre. He was charged with desceration, sorcery, murder; but he silenced his calumniators in the most conclusive way, by the production of the reputedly murdered man, the Meletian Bishop, Arsenius. But as his condemnation had been determined beforehand, Athanasius "resolved to make a bold and dangerous experiment, whether the throne was inaccessible to the voice of truth."* He went to Constantinople, presented himself before the emperor, and demanded that either a lawful council should be assembled, or the members of the Tyrian synod summoned to meet him in the imperial presence. For a moment reason and truth prevailed. But Eusebius, the crafty, touching the point where Constantine was sorest and most sensitive, said: "He once threatened to stop the Alexandrian corn-ships bound for Constantinople." Athanasius denied; Eusebius re-affirmed; and the emperor banished, 336, the accused to Trier, then in Gaul.

For two years and a half he lived at Trier, restful, studious, watching as from afar the movements in the Empire and in the church. The news was now and then momentous. In 336, he would hear that Arius had sud-

*Gibbon, "Decline and Fall," C. XXI.

denly and tragically died, just as he was about, in obedience to the imperial mandate, to be received into the church. A year later Constantine himself passed to his account, and in 338 Athanasius was restored to his flock. "The people ran in crowds to see his face; the churches were full of rejoicing; thanksgivings were offered up everywhere; the ministers and clergy thought that day the happiest of their lives." He was magnanimous, and could proudly boast that "he caused no imprisonment, no bloodshed—not a man was banished from Alexandria for his sake." But his enemies were busy and Constantius, the new emperor of the East, became their facile tool. His was the sort of mind the Arian formula convinced—what so perfectly lent itself to dialectical dexterities must be the very truth of God. And he could not brook a bishop who despised his formula and denied his authority in things divine. So the imperial decree invaded the sacred rights of the church. Athanasius was again sent into exile, 340, and Gregory, the Cappadocian, was instituted, as the new bishop or Patriarch. The wanderer sailed for Italy, was kindly received and hospitably entertained by the church at Rome, used his leisure to good purpose, addressed by pen the church of East and West, powerfully influenced the Latin peoples, persuaded at length Constantius into friendship, and was restored to his see October 21, 346. The day of his return was one of "glorious festivity." To the fond imagination of Gregory Nazianzus it seemed as if the Alexandrian people had become another Nile, flowing along the highways, covering every bank and height whence they could see and salute him. So joyful was the time that it became a proverb, and the day of gladness and promise was "like the day when Father Athanasius came home."

For ten years he was allowed to labour in his loved city; but not untroubled. The death of Constans deprived him of his truest friend. Constantius, fickle, prone with that soul of his to Arian formula, inclined to

exercise his brief authority over the church, liked not the inflexible courage, the jealous independence, the devotion to Christ and His kinghood of the great Patriarch. So it was determined to remove him, and the rude soldier, Syrianus, was sent to do it. The scene has been described by Athanasius himself. On Thursday, February 8, 356, he was in the church of St. Thomas, conducting a night-long service. Suddenly the church was surrounded. Athanasius sat down on his throne, commanded the deacon to read the 136th Psalm, and all the people responded—"For His mercy endureth forever." Then the word was given, "every man to his home." But the soldiers broke in with a fierce shout, swords flashed, arrows were discharged, the crowding people were trampled down, many wounded, some killed, while above the din rose voices urging the Patriarch to escape. But he would not go till the people were saved, and amid the last, in the darkness unobserved, he made his way through the soldiery, passed out of the city to wait till "the indignation was overpast." Finding all appeals to Constantius hopeless, he turned towards the desert, and found refuge and a home amid "the pathless solitudes which surrounded upper Egypt, and the monasteries and hermitages of the Thebaid." There he devoted himself to the exposition and defence of the doctrine he best knew and most loved. The day was dark; in a less faithful heart hope had died. The apostasy seemed general, Arianism was victorious at court and truculent in the church. The heart of Hosius failed him, Tiberius disowned his past, and Athanasius was alone. As Hooker so finely says: *"This was the plain condition of those times: the whole world against Athanasius and Athanasius against it; half a hundred of years spent in doubtful trial which of the two in the end would prevail, the side which had all, or else the part which had no friend but God and death; the one a defender of his innocency, the other a finisher of all his troubles."

*Ecclesiastical Polity, 1-530. (Ed. 1825.)

Constantine died, 361; Julian assumed the imperial purple. Paganism flamed up into an esctasy of joy over the succession of the Apostate. The pagans of Alexandria seized George, the Arian bishop, dragged him out and kicked him to death; and in February, 362, Athanasius returned. But it was only for a little while. He was too courageous to be spared for he was in the revived pagan speech, by pre-eminence, "the foe of the gods." So the old man had to be a wanderer once more, though a voice from out his weeping flock assured him—"It is but a cloud, it will soon pass; be of good heart." He was by imperial orders pursued. He embarked on the Nile; his pursuers followed. The imperial emissaries met a boat coming down the river, and demanded—"What of Athanasius? Where is he?" "Not far off," was the reply, and the boat sailed on carrying Athanasius in it, who was possibly himself the speaker. His home was once more in Thebaid, whence, however, he was soon to return. Julian died in June, 363, and with his death the troubles might be said to end, and a happier day dawn. Usefully and heroically the old man laboured, careful of many things, loving the truth he had lived for, the church that lived by it, the hopes the church bore for the dying Roman State but reviving humanity, and in the spring of 374 he peacefully laid down his burden and entered on his eternal rest. He lived for his own age and, therefore, for all ages; and looking back over the centuries we thank him for his noble struggle, for the splendid victory he achieved for the truth of God and the liberties of the church of Jesus Christ.

THE USE OF THE SCRIPTURES IN THEOLOGY!*

BY REV. WAYLAND HOYT, D. D., LL. D.

It goes without saying that these lectures are extremely interesting. Beyond most men Dr. Clarke is master of a fascinating and enthralling style. There is a certain singular charm in what he writes. I suppose no technical book has ever commanded wider or more various audience than his "Outlines of Theology." There is not a dry page in it, nor one difficult to the ordinary reader. Somehow upon his pages a soft and gentle sunlight seems to fall as in June days, and the flowers bloom and the birds sing. Nor is there any straining to get them to bloom and sing. They do it spontaneously. The high themes are so arrayed in the garments of shining, pleasing speech one's attention cannot but follow easily and joyously. What is so true about the style of the "Outlines of Theology" is as true of the style of these lectures. But light and flowers and birds may hover over and adorn and sing in and about dangerous ravines and precipices. I think, though somewhat hiddenly, these gap and threaten in the "Outlines of Theology." In these lectures they are opener and more disclosed. Indeed, for myself, I do not know a book which, while it is professedly devoutly Christain, is more subtly and speciously dangerous to the fabric of our faith.

But let me most heartily and gladly go with Dr. Clarke in his averments of the Lord Jesus Christ as the crowning, ultimate, authoritative, revelation to us of God—all through these lectures there are such averments. It is necessary to my purpose that I quote freely.

"But the specialty of the Bible is Jesus Christ. On these pages we have practically all that we know of His history and His works. He uttered the highest, simplest,

*The Nathaniel William Taylor Lectures for 1905. Given before the Divinity School of Yale University. By William Newton Clarke, D. D., Professor of Christian Theology in Colgate University.

most self-evidencing, most final body of truth concerning God and the relations of men to Him that this world has ever received; and here we find it, together with writings that show how it was understood by receptive minds, and brought into life as a transforming power." Page 3.

"The fullness of the Christian light is given in Christ." Page 43.

"Theology is the orderly presentation of what we have reason to hold as true concerning God and the relations of men to Him; and the Scriptures are those writings which preserve the story of Hebrew and early Christian religion, with Jesus Christ and His revelation concerning God and man for their crowning element. For us Christians theology and the Christian Scriptures thus conceived, are manifestly inseparable, and the point at which they meet is plain. They meet in Christ. He is the common possession of the two—He and what He contributes —and He is their common glory. He is the crown of the Old Testament and the New, and the crown of the Bible as a whole, and in the field of theology there is none that compares with Him in clearness of revelation or in fullness of light and truth. If He has made theology to be Christian, it is equally true that He has made the Scriptures to be Christian. To either there is none like Him." Page 51.

"From Him"—Jesus—"there came forth the clearest, simplest, worthiest and truest view of God and the relation of God to men that has existed in this world; and in Him there has proved to be inexhaustible power to establish that right relation between God and men in actual life. There is no doubt or mystery as to what His revelation was and is. He has sent forth living truth concerning God, and has made it to live in men." Page 57.

Perhaps this much quotation is sufficient. Certainly it would be difficult to find words or to shape sentences which could more luminously tell and set forth the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ as the crowning, ultimate,

never-to-be-superceded, revelation and authority in religion. And with this certainly agrees the Scripture:

"God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in *his* Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, through whom also he made the worlds; who being the effulgence of his glory, and the very image of his substance, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had made purification of sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high."

What now is the attitude of this Jesus Christ—this worthiest, truest, ultimate, authoritative revelation of God to men, and of men's relation to God—what now is the attitude of this Jesus Christ to the Scriptures of the Old Testament?

This Jesus declares the Scriptures of the Old Testament, or, at any event, that portion of them attributed to Moses, to be the *word of God.* Listen to Mark, 7:5-13:

"And the Pharisees and the scribes ask him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders, but eat their bread with defiled hands? And he said unto them, Well did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites, as it is written,

"This people honoureth me with their lips,
"But their heart is far from me.
"But in vain do they worship me,
"Teaching *as their* doctrines the precepts of men.

"Ye leave the *commandment of God,* and hold fast the tradition of men. And he said unto them, Full well do ye reject the *commandment of God,* that ye may keep your tradition. For *Moses said,* Honour thy father and thy mother; and, He that speaketh evil of father or mother, let him die the death: but ye say, If a man shall say to his father or his mother, That wherewith thou mightest have been profited by me is Corban, that is to say, Given *to God;* ye no longer suffer him to do aught for his father

or his mother; making void *the word of God* by your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things ye do."

In the Greek that word of God is λόγου τοῦ θεοῦ —the translation is accurate. Unequivocally here this crowning revelation of God, this Jesus Christ declares that so much of the Old Testament Scriptures as are commonly attributed to Moses are the *word of God.* Turn now to Matthew, 5:18:

"Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished."

Here the reference of this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, is to the prophets as well as to the law. No slightest atom of either, this Jesus declares, shall come to failure. Neither jot nor tittle of them may be disestemed. As the bulb pushes to the flower this so precious deposit of God in the Old Testament Scriptures shall come to exactest and fullest bloom.

Then further to John 10:31-37:

"The Jews took up stones again to stone him. Jesus answered them, Many good works have I shewed you from the Father; for which of those works do ye stone me? The Jews answered him, For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God. Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the *word of God* came (and the scripture cannot be broken), say ye of him, whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am *the* Son of God?"

Here Psalm 82:6—"I said ye are gods," though it be song, is invested with the dignity of law. Here, again, the Old Testament Scripture is designated the *word of God;* here, in addition, this Jesus, this crowning revelation of

God, asserts that the Old Testament Scripture is irrefragable—*οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι* connot be loosened, undone, dissolved. Turn, in addition, to Luke 24: 25-27, Christ is saying to the despairing disciples on their way to Emmaus: "O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken! Behooved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning from Moses and from the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself."

Join with this the 44th to the 48th verses of the same chapter, Jesus is saying to the affrighted disciples after He had assurred them that though risen from the dead, He was veritably Himself: "These are my words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, how that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their mind, that they might understand the scriptures; and he said unto them, Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem."

Notice these words, "Moses and all the prophets"—"in all the scriptures"—"written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms"—might understand the Scriptures—"thus it is written."

How more unequivocally could even this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, dignify, enhance, glorify, declare the mighty and limitless value of the Old Testament Scriptures? Whatever these Old Testament Scriptures may be to the modern destructive critic, they certainly were to this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, august, commanding, sacred.

And such instances of such recognizings of the Old Testament Scriptures—and we possess them substantially in the shape in which He taught and used them—

such instances of such recognizings of the Old Testament Scriptures by this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, could be indefinitely multiplied.

And will you go on to notice that this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God to man, was a great and habitual quoter of *proof-texts* from the Old Testament Scriptures. Let an instance or two suffice. Amid the stress of His temptation this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, vanquishes Satan by texts quoted from the Deuteronomy of these Old Testament Scriptures. "It is written, man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." "Again it is written, Thou shalt not make trial of the Lord thy God." "Get thee hence Satan; for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shall thou serve."

To the Sadducee's quibbling about the seven times married woman and the resurrection, Jesus replies: "Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as angels in heaven. But as touching the resurrection of the dead, *have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God,* saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not *the* God of the dead, but of the living."

To the young man who came asking what good thing he should do to inherit eternal life, Jesus quoted the Commandments as written in Exodus, Deuteronomy and Leviticus. The solemn and repeated "I say unto you" of the sermon on the Mount concerning murder, adultery, profanity, retaliation, enemies, is not abrogation of the law, but is declarative and applicative of the law concerning these things. Jesus quotes that He may disclose how the law of God pushes and pierces to the thoughts and intents of the heart.

And almost the last word of this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, is a quotation from the twenty-second Psalm: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken

me"? And there is scarcely a book in the entire range of these Old Testament Scriptures from which He does not frequently quote.

To this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, these Old Testament Scriptures are, most manifestly, standard and directive.

But what of the relation of this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, to the Scriptures of the New Testament?

During the sojourn on earth of this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, the Scriptures of the New Testament were not yet written. But the Scriptures of the New Testament are, by anticipation, and in the clearest way, shielded and authenticated by the special promises of this Jesus. And surely, if this Jesus be the best, worthiest, ultimate revelation of God, as Dr. Clarke admits and so constantly insists on, this Jesus had both the right and the ability to make such anticipating and authenticating promises. Listen to John, 14:25-26:

"These things have I spoken unto you, while *yet* abiding with you. But the Comforter, *even* the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you."

Here this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, puts this stamp of authentication not only upon a divinely given teaching which should be ministered to the Apostles, but also upon their divinely helped and so trustworthy *remembering* of what this Jesus Himself had taught the Apostles.

Listen again to John 16:12-15: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth: for he shall not speak from himself; but what things soever he shall hear, *these* shall he speak: and he shall declare unto you the things that are to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall take of mine,

and shall declare *it* unto you. All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he taketh of mine, and shall declare it unto you."

Could promise of a divine assistance, of a divine inspiration, if you choose to call it such, of a divinely-helped disclosure and unfolding of truth concerning this Jesus—truth as yet dim and latent in the minds of these apostles—but to be revealed to them; of a divine guidance into all such truths—could promise of a divine superintending, enlarging and quickening of perception, ability of grasping and setting forth, could such promise be at once more aboundingly and unmistakably given? As another has suggested, the cry "Back to Christ," is a good cry. Christ is forever to be the name and standard of interpretation of what apostles say. But when you get back to Christ must you not hear Christ saying, "On to the apostles," if you would know the fuller, deeper, larger meaning of that which Christ Himself had taught? And that this anticipatory promise of Jesus was a real and valid one, the Day of Pentecost is, at least, beginning proof. His to-be New Testament Scriptures are sanctioned and authenticated by the promises of Jesus. And surely, if this Jesus be, as Dr. Clarke so steadily asserts, the worthiest, truest, crowning revelation of God, this Jesus had both the forecasting ability and authority to make such authenticating promises. The Scriptures of the New Testament are authoritative because this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, promised His apostles divine guidance into all the truth.

But now let us open the pages of Dr. Clarke. I quote freely that I may not misrepresent.

"The ground for the ancient manner of use"—of Scripture—"in the doctrine of an equal and infallible inspiration is gone." Page 50.

"The Scriptures contain that indispensable material without which theology would not be Christian or rise to the height of truth, and they contain a great deal more.

Speaking in terms of time we can say that they contain a Christian and a pre-Christian part; speaking in terms of quality they contain a Christian and a non-Christian element. What is pre-Christian, or non-Christian, may lie close upon the spiritual borders of Christianity, or may be far removed from the Christian view of things."

"The point to be held fast and for certain is that the Bible does bring us the contribution of Christ, together with much that did not proceed from Him; and this besides, that the difference between these two elements is not necessarily a difference in quality. That great word, Christian, is not merely a term that belongs on one side of a time boundary; it is a descriptive and qualitative term, with a meaning in itself. There certainly is non-Christian matter in the Old Testament, and for aught we know there may be in the New. In either place the question is one of spiritual quality, character, kinship with the revelation that we have in Christ.

"It is the Christian element in the Scriptures that must be received as constituent element into our theology, for it is indispensable and formative there. But non-Christian matter contained in the Bible need not, and must not, be so received. Nothing that is not Christian in its genuine quality has any place in our Christian theology, even though we may have read it on the pages of the Bible."

"It might be thought that the Christian element in the Scriptures consisted of the words of Jesus, or was co-extensive with the record of His life. Or it might be identified with the New Testament, the part of the Bible that was written by Christians. But the test already proposed, of character and quality, is more internal and searching than any such test of localization and measurement. That is Christian which enters into or accords with the view of divine realities which Jesus Christ revealed." Pages 53, 54, 56.

And the norm of discrimination, by which we are to

judge of and separate the non-Christian, pre-Christian and Christian elements in both the Old Testament and the New is, perhaps, most clearly stated by Dr. Clarke in this sentence: "The Christian element, or the gift of Christ, is not a body of words, or even a body of thoughts, but a body of truth." Page 60.

But yet, concerning this "body of truth" which finds expression necessarily in neither words nor even thoughts, Dr. Clarke goes on in almost the next sentence to confess it is something somewhat difficult of comprehension. Dr. Clarke says: "I have often found students unable to grasp the distinction between a body of truth and a body of thoughts, or even words. They have always thought of truth as expressed in words, and of the most exact wording as making the best expression." But Dr. Clarke goes on to say "the Christian body of truth is a body of spiritual reality put into life. Until we make this view of Christ's gift our own, we shall not rise to the spiritual clearness of the true faith, or appreciate the true glory of theology." Pages 60, 61.

Dr. Clarke goes on, but I think vainly, to reply to objections to such a norm of discrimination amid the Scripture as this. Such a norm of discrimination is nothing plain and steady, it is a "moving point," says one. But is it not possibly that and necessarily, a moving point, when your norm is not definitely what Christ has said and done, but is really what you chance to think Christ ought to have said and done?

But your standard is altogether *subjective,* says another. Dr. Clarke denies this. "But," I quote his words, "I freely own," he says, "that the principle gives the need of a standard visible and audible, so unequivocal that it can be understood only in one way." What is that but confusing, after all, the real and masterful subjectivity of the standard? For here, again, the standard is not definitely what Christ did do and say, it is what, in

this doing and saying, seems to you, for the instant, fitting that he do and say which is the standard.

So then this "body of truth," so nebulous and various that, as Dr. Clarke himself confesses, it is quite difficult to get students to comprehend it; what shall we say of the difficulty it flings in the way of the men of the street, the usual throng of the persons who make up our churches? To them this unworded and even dimly conceivable "body of truth" is to be the test and standard of decision as to what to accept in them or to reject in them, as we go through the Scriptures, both of the Old Testament and the New.

Well, what will the acceptance of this cloudy and varying so-called "body of truth" do for us in our use of Scripture?

(*a*) It will deliver us from the need of quoting proof-texts. This Dr. Clarke is constantly asserting. But is this a real deliverance where Jesus Christ, the crowning revelation of God, was so constantly falling back on the "it is written" of the Scripture? was Himself so constantly quoting special texts of Scripture?

(*b*) This so-called "body of truth" will set aside and exclude from use large portions of the Scripture, both Old Testament and New.

According to Dr. Clarke this "body of truth" will exclude all acceptance of the Genesis statements of the origin of man and the origin of sin. Jesus Christ makes no statement or quotation as to either of these. Says Dr. Clarke: "Theology needs a right conception of the human race, but does not obtain from the Bible an account of its origin, or the origin of the world. The facts must be learned from other sources. This is a case in which the Scriptures, rightly read, withdraw their sources." Dr. Clarke also says: "We have no historical narrative of the beginning of sin, and theology receives from the Scriptures no record of that beginning. Theology must

account for sin, if at all, without the aid of such a narrative."

It is true that Jesus Christ makes no direct statements as to the origin of the world, the race, or sin. But it is also true that this Jesus Christ, this crowning revelation of God, quotes again and again from the Scriptures of Genesis; speaks as though the flood was an historic verity. Is this fact of our Lord's reverent quoting from Genesis to be entirely ignored?

Besides, though Jesus makes Himself no reference to the origin of sin, His apostle, St. Paul, does make such reference largely; does fall back upon the Genesis statement, and does steadily declare that the Gospel he preached and wrote was given him by direct revelation of Jesus Christ. Is such fact to be slightingly ignored? Also, according to Dr. Clarke, this so-called "body of truth" excludes from Scripture and theology all vicarious, propitiatory element in the atonement of our Lord. Rule out the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is only a lot of Alexandrian allegorizing. Says Dr. Clarke: "The book of Leviticus has done more to give form to the doctrine of salvation than any single book of the New Testament." And the Hebrews is a Christianizing statement and application of Leviticus. But Dr. Clarke declares that the "altar forms" of Scripture are clashing with this "body of truth." So rule all out. And St. Paul's statement of the vicariousness of the atonement, why St. Paul states the atonement under the forms of Jewish and Roman law, therefore rule out such statements. Dr. Clarke does not think that they comport with this "body of truth." Therefore rule them out. And all this notwithstanding the fact that this Jesus, this crowning revelation of God, Himself expressly declared that He came to give His life a *ransom* for many—ransom, lutron—a peculiarly vicarious word—notwithstanding the further fact that this Jesus, the crowning revelation of God, quotes Leviticus as Scripture; notwithstanding the further fact that this

Apostle St. Paul, whose statements concerning our Lord's sacrifice for us are red with altar forms, makes declaration that the good news of God he was commissioned to preach was veritably given him by revelation from the risen, ascended, glorified Jesus Christ.

But Dr. Clarke would also, testing them by this so-called "body of truth"—this subjective standard, this standard of what anybody may think—ought to go to form this body of truth. Dr. Clarke would rule out, by this standard, from Scripture and from theology the "advent—expectation" "which can be quoted from the lips of Jesus Christ Himself." No, either this is true concerning this advent-expectation that Jesus Christ falsely conceived the time and form of the kingdom, or that the synoptic writers have falsely attributed to Jesus the advent-expectation.

And this notwithstanding the fact that our Lord's prophecy concerning the destruction of Jerusalem which was prefigurement of the advent-expectation, was, how precisely, fulfilled.

Is it not a fair question? Does Dr. Clarke in his even slashing excision of Scripture at all follow that loving and reverent use of Scripture set us by the example of our Lord? If Jesus Christ, as Dr. Clarke so steadily insists, is the crowning and authoritative revelation of God, has Dr. Clarke, or anybody else, a right to so clash with the example of Jesus Christ in the use of Scripture?

I think this word of Prof. George Adam Smith, whether he always consistently practices it or not, a word far truer, more reverent, limitlessly more Christian: "The Bible of the Jews in our Lord's time was practically our Old Testament. For us its supreme sanction is that which it derived from Christ Himself. What was indispensable to the Redeemer must always be indispensable to the redeemed."

Another question. Is not Dr. Clarke's use of Scripture, in his so wildly slashing way of using it, radically destruc-

tive of the basal principles of our Baptist denomination? Certainly Dr. Clarke's way of using Scripture at once and forever relaxes the grip of Scripture as Scripture. This so-called "body of truth" possessing such elements as Dr. Clarke declares it does for himself, what is there to prevent anyone from saying, "But my 'body of truth' does not for me hold either this element or that?" What is to prevent any one from saying, "I exclude from *my* body of truth the demand of Jesus for the new birth, it is only a Johanine notion foisted into the teaching of Jesus, I exclude it, if you please." What is to prevent any one from saying, "My body of truth excludes baptism by immersion; the great commission is only a synoptic addition to the teaching of Jesus?"

According to Dr. Clarke any man may have, indeed, ought to have, his own shifting "body of truth." If anybody, for reasons good to himself, shall exclude the doctrine of the New Birth, or the duty of Baptism by immersion in obedience to Christ, what is to hinder him? In the light of Dr. Clarke's norm of discrimination amid the Scripture, all Scripture has lost its authoritative grip.

But the fundamental and persistent position of the Baptist denomination has always been the sceptre of the Scripture. Because the authoritative Scripture so commands and demands we believe and practice as we do.

But Dr. Clarke's notion of the unauthoritative Scripture puts dynamite under the foundations of our Baptist faith.

BOOK REVIEWS.

APOLOGETICS.

The Church's One Foundation.

By Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, M. A., LL. D. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York.

This book is issued as a "popular edition." Our readers will recall the first edition which appeared three or four years ago. The work was reviewed quite generally at the time and has been rendering admirable service in the interest of the evangelical faith ever since. Indeed it is one of the most clear and convincing of the briefer works which have appeared in recent years on its chosen subject. It deals with the heart of Christianity, Jesus Christ himself, and with critical theories relating to the Gospel records. Criticism has during the last generation attempted from so many individual points of view to undermine these records that it is a considerable task even to enumerate the attempts. With criticism as such Dr. Nicoll has no quarrel. As he says in his introduction "The church cannot without disloyalty and cowardice quarrel with criticism as such." But, as Dr. Nicoll shows, when the claims of criticism are subjected to careful scrutiny it is found not only that there is no unanimity in the conclusions reached but also that criticism is without canons of judgment and critical methods for reaching conclusions on many of the problems with which it assumes to deal. It would be a great gain if criticism could define its function and limits, and then adhere to both. The scholastics never dogmatized about the unknown in a wilder manner than many of the modern critics. The inductive method which limits assertions to known facts has had a curious reversal in this particular sphere of investigation.

Dr. Nicoll points out the real issues raised by the

destructive critical process as applied to the New Testament, and shows their significance for faith. He writes in a style most lucid and interesting and exhibits a familiarity with his subject which reassures the reader from the outset. There are few of the technicalities which, in the hands of so capable a scholar, it would be natural to expect. We do not know of any book which we would recommend more heartily to the mass of thoughtful men and women, younger as well as older, who in our day have been disturbed in their faith by the claims of criticism. E. Y. Mullins.

The Crown of Science, the Incarnation of God in Mankind.

By A. Morris Stewart, M. A. Fourth edition. London. Andrew Melrose. 1904. pp. xvi, 223. Price 3s 6d.

In the enlargement of knowledge and the elaboration of theories in this new day of scientific discovery, research and outreach very divergent attitudes toward religion, especially toward the Christian religion, have been all along evident. That the present temper of thinking men is increasingly reverent and religious is beyond question and cause for fresh hope in the onward and upward advance of man. Our larger learning sought out for itself new forms of interpretation and theories of content. The new wine must need have its new skins. Many there were who cared little for saving either the old or the new and with reckless hands poured the new wine into old skins only to exult in seeing them burst and to revel in the abundance of the new wine little concerned for saving it.

Maturer thought has changed much of this and is changing more. The new skins are good also for the old wine and will themselves grow old. A large school has arisen to make use of the conceptions and theories of the larger learning not only to conserve but to expand and enforce these fundamental facts and truths that are as old as man is old, because they set forth the relations of man and God.

No one has done better service in this way than Mr. Stewart. No one has seen more deeply and reflected more profoundly nor written with more of vigor and suggestiveness. "The endeavor * * is to state * * the unity of the energy and life and understanding and will which are in all Nature and especially in Man *; the convergence, showing and communication of these in the Son of God *; their operation in the Higher Life which He brought * * and corresponding to which S. Paul indicates a marvelous biology *; the consummation of this process in an Ultimate Incarnation of God in Mankind."

This author sees clearly that the slavery to Moral Law against which Paul labored has its counterpart in our time in Natural Law which is "a new bondage oppressing human life." Hence "we need somewhat that is more than natural, and stronger than nature" and we find that "God Himself, who made the laws that threaten men, has come within their circle to meet them there." "We must not fail to see in the Christ Himself, 'the Power of God,' and in His Religion, the Crown of Science." This is a masterful little work. W. O. Carver.

The Final Preservation of the Saints Versus The Perseverance of the Saints.

By Rev. R. Venting. Published by Alfred Houless, London, and R. L. Allen & Son, Glasgow. 1903. 74 pp. 4 x 3¼.

A brief, but comprehensive, scriptural discussion of this doctrine and its implications. There is also an effort to meet the objections so far as they are based in the Scriptures. The work is dogmatic in form and spirit but its interpretations are usually correct and its purpose is deeply earnest. W. O. Carver.

Christian Belief Interpreted by Christian Experience. The Barrows Lectures 1902–3.

By Charles Cuthbert Hall D. D. The University of Chicago Press 1895.

These world-famous lectures now appear in this au-

thorized edition precisely in the form in which they were delivered in India. The lecturer wisely decided to retain the forms of local delivery so as to set before Western readers the manner and style of the work done in India, for Indians. It is evident, as Dr. Mackican, the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Bombay, says in the Introduction, that, though these lectures mark Dr. Hall's first actual contact with the people of India, his mental contact with them is of much older standing; and we may believe, what he further says, that they are the fruit, not only of a deep spiritual realization and masterful philosophic grasp of the essence of Christianity, but of a careful, sympathetic study of the ancient things of India, and of a very extensive knowledge of the present movements of Indian religious thought. The author appeals to his Western readers to remember that there is a Christian essence, which, like a disembodied spirit, may subsist without the corporal vesture of theological definition sanctioned by Western usage; to transport themselves in imagination into the pantheistic atmosphere of the East, where religion is the chief business of life, while the validity of personal religious experience is discarded by many as illusion; to recall that the religion of Jesus Christ, and its Semitic antecedents and cognates, were primarily Oriental; and that the East to-day, not without reason, prefers the primitive type, with its accentuation of Oriental features, to the widely divergent type of modern Christianity in Europe and America. He believes that at the present stage in the Christianization of the East the most urgent and vital things to be done are these: to give moral content to the Idea of God; to differentiate the Incarnation of the Son of God from the incarnations of Hinduism; to *ethicise* religion in the thought and practice of the individual. This, he well says, requires a preparation of spirit, as well as of mind, a chastened and humbled temper, as well as intellectual research, indeed, and above all, a heart of unfaltering faith and all-embracing love. Surely, whatever

the lectures lack, they show remarkable breadth of conception, deftness of touch and eloquence of expression, and a profound and glowing sympathy with the religious strivings of all who in any age or clime have been seekers after God. Indeed, it would be difficult to find a better example of a Christian approach to the non-Christian mind than that here made; and we are not surprised to learn of the impression produced in the various centers where educated Indians gathered to hear the lectures, or of the appreciative response which they awakened. It may be not unreasonably objected that the lecturer shut his eyes to the sadness of the degeneracy and spiritual failure of which the best Indian minds are profoundly conscious, and dealt only with the ideal side of Indian thought and aspiration; but it was better, perhaps, to have addressed himself to the supreme, positive aim of his mission—to exhibit Christ as the Fulfiller, and His religion as the ultimate realization of that Ideal toward which humanity has been feeling its uncertain way through all the ages. At any rate, the secret of the inadequacy of even the highest non-Christian thought to explain God and man, and to lead man up to his truer, fuller life in God, is here expounded by him with philosophic thoroughness, and yet with rare tact and tenderness; while the adequacy and completeness of the revelation of God in Christ are set forth and illustrated in the light that comes from religious experience the world over.

GEO. B. EAGER.

Paul Judson.

By Edward Bagby Pollard, Ph. D. The Baptist Argus, Louisville Ky. 1905. Price $1.00.

This is the best story of Baptist principle and conquest that I know. It is the career of a boy from the Kentucky mountains who fought his way to success and to the Baptist position. Dr. Pollard has written with genuine skill and puts the Baptist case in the modern spirit of conciliation without sacrifice of essential truth. It is a

book to circulate by the thousand and ought to be in demand for a generation at least. A. T. Robertson.

Die Religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Iudenthums im Zeitalter Jesu.

Von M. Friedländer. Georg Reimer's Druck, Berlin, Germany. 1905. S. 380. To be had of Lemcke, Buechner & Co, New York.

Friedländer is well known as the author of Sittengeschichte Soms and Griechische Philosophie in Alten Testament. This is a very able and important work which no New Testament scholar can afford to ignore. It is more even than the title implies. The book not only gives a masterly survey of Palestinian and Hellenistic Judiasm in the first and second centuries before Christ, as well as the first Christian century, but it attempts briefly and very skilfully to set the career and teaching of Jesus in proper relation to the current Judaism. But the book goes still further and seeks to show how Paul as both Pharisee and Hellenist became the congenial interpreter of Jesus.

It would be hard to find a volume that hits more exactly the vital problems in New Testament teaching of today. Friedlaender sketches briefly the rise of the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, and Therapeutæ. He shows how the Apocalyptic writers were the popular prophets of the time. He contrasts clearly the Pharisees and the Am-ha-aretz. The Minim in the Talmud are shown not to be the Christians, but in origin a pre-Christian sect opposed by both Pharisee and Christians. The influence of Greek philosophy and the Sybilline oracle upon Hellenistic Judaism is unfolded. The volume emphasizes anew the importance of a knowledge of current Jewish theology in order to get the proper background for the teaching of Jesus and Paul. Friedlaender makes a constructive effort, and a not wholly unsuccessful one, to fit that teaching into the time and show its relation to the Old Testament. He presses too far the correspondence between the divine claims of Jesus and the phrases in Philo and the Apocalyptic books. But he has done a

notable service for New Testament learning. Jesus is no less divine because he used the language of his time.

A. T. Robertson.

Modern Mysticism; or the Covenants of the Spirit, their Scope and Limitations.

By Rev. J. B. Shearer, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Biblical Introduction, Davidson College, N. C. Puplished by Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Va. pp 116. Price 75 cents net.

This volume is the third series of "Davidson College Divinity Lectures, Ott's Foundation," 1905. The lectures present an interesting combination—"Modern "Mysticism" discussed after the manner of Mediæval Scholasticism, only wanting the thoroughness of that outgrown method.

We have often heard of "salvation by logic." Here we have an exposition of religion by logic. No one who has given thoughtful attention to the movements of mysticism can question that they are chargeable with many faults and these our lecturer has hit upon with tolerable accuracy and dealt with in a thoroughly unsympathetic spirit and with little recognition of the vital energy of these movements.

The fundamental positions of the lectures are a fairly accurate and profound analysis of Scripture doctrines but if we must compare the author's deductions from his principles with the mystic's divergence from them it will be hard to locate the honors. Whether it is worse to make crude and unwarranted claims of the vital workings of the Holy Spirit or by the forms of logic nullify His manifestation in practical consciousness one need hardly seek to say.

W. O. Carver.

God's Choice of Men. A Study of Scripture.

By Wm. R. Richards. Charles Scribners's Sons, New York. 1905.

The author of these stirring chapters is an independent thinker—a veritable free lance among Presbyterians. His appeal is not confessional but to Scripture. "It is hardly to be supposed," he says, "that my effort would

receive the unqualified approval of those who profess to speak for the traditional positions." "I myself do not profess to speak for traditional positions, or any other, but *simply to open the Word of God and let that speak for itself.*" He may well announce the result as "a new-fashioned treatment of the old-fashioned doctrine of God's election of men." He regards "election to service," quoting Dr. Henry van Dyke, as " the supreme saving truth." He believes that this old faith in a divine election still offers men the right sort of courage for worthy living and for good hope in dying." He divides the material, for convenience and clearness into two parts. In the first he gives from Scripture various examples of God's choice of men, and some significant examples of human response to the divine call. In the second he vigorously investigates the purpose of the election, raising the inquiry what God chooses men for. The chapters appear substantially in the original form of discourses preached in the Brick Church, New York City. "The provoking occasion" of the book is explained in the opening sentences of the second chapter—a sweeping editorial charge in a leading New York daily that Presbyterian clergymen of to-day are guilty of hyprocisy and need to "vindicate their sincerity"—the question in the popular mind being how a man can be outwardly faithful to a creed which it is thought he has inwardly rejected. The answer given is straightforward and without evasions. Touching the confessional treatment of God's Eternal Decree, he "confesses," with "innumerable loyal Presbyterians," "that our fathers tried to settle too many things about these high mysteries." To believe the confession perfect is forbidden the Presbyterian minister by the very terms of his reception of the confession, in which he is made to say that the Scripture is the only infallible rule. Touching the present Revised Confession, however, he avows, "I am willing to take my stand before the world, and call God to witness that I have no apologies to offer for it, and employ no mental reservations in sub-

scribing to it." The book may be placed in DeQuincy's category of "the literature of power," and will abundantly repay reading. GEO. B. EAGER.

The Finality of the Christian Religion.

By George Burman Foster, Porfessor of the Philosophy of Religion. The Decenninal Publications, second series, Vol. XVI. The University Press, Chicago. Pp. xv and 518. Price $4.00 net, $4.22 postpaid.

Two things make demand here for more extended notice of this work than its attitude and contents could claim on merit; the relation of the publication and the author to the University of Chicago, and the deep note of humanity in the entire work. Its place in the Decennial Publications with the imprint of the University serves to emphasize the institutional character that must in any case belong to a work issuing from the occupant of a University chair. The *preface* touches the vital cord of sympathy that binds men of earnestness however far they may differ. When one knows that "the book is a mirror of the development of the author's own experience," one must take interest in it and the inteerst grows as one shares or even appreciates, though he may not share, the author's belief "that a greater multitude will travel, with bleeding feet, the same *via dolorosa* . . ."

Yet this work has received more attention than it deserves. Its radical positions, its iconoclastic contentions and the vital issues involved have caused radicals to leap for joy and herald a new gun in ther batteries while some of the "traditionals" have been terrified afresh, and the "heresy hunter" has judged from the noise and commotion that he is on the trail of big game.

The author of this work is a deeply pious, scholarly, sincere teacher who wants to believe the truth, if he cannot know it. As we see him in this book he is not so much the teacher as the student, even though of negative dogmatism there is quite a deal. He is thinking and toiling toward some goal. It seems a pity he could not have waited until he were a little farther on the road before

calling quite so much attention to his uncertain track. For the work is chiefly destructive. Again there is want of unity, originality, independence. Nothing is more true of the scientific, critical and philosophic situation of the day than its variety. It is full of differences, inconsistencies, uncertainties.

It is interesting, too, that when we are seeing all the ancient authorities flayed, drawn and quartered before our eyes, when even Jesus himself is unworthy when he is authoritative, that at the same moment the great names of "experts" in the various fields of investigation must so terrify and intimidate us that we dare not have an opinion of our own. Religion must no longer have any "authority," for that would conflict with "assured results" of modern research.

Our author must needs use for this volume philosophy, history, science, criticism and, be it said in fullest appreciation, faith. In all the realms of knowledge he has chosen his masters, Dutch and German they are, in the main, and the highest stars in their respective constellations. But Dr. Foster has not been able to unify the teaching from these sources, and with all his own vigor of thought he seems not yet to have found any position which is assured.

On the faith side of his materials he draws on his own experience and insight, and here we find strength, comfort, inspiration. This reviewer has nowhere seen an estimate of the Master that for incisiveness, vigor, sympathy, spiritual insight, surpasses that of page 467. In fifteen pages preceding this section there is as gross and unscientific a misrepresentation of Jesus as one will likely find. Here, however, one finds a true interpretation of Jesus, as far as it goes. In most of his discussion of Jesus Dr. Foster yields himself the interpreter of Hermann, Wernle, Wrede, Bossuet, without being able to reach a unified result, but in the pages referred to he breaks away and interprets the Christ whom he has seen

and loved and worshipped in another temple than that of rationalistic culture.

A phase of development in modern religious thought under the influence of current scientific and critical presuppositions and methods, a phase psychologically interesting and religiously significant, is manifest in a considerable number of scholars, devout in spirit, sincere in purpose and conviction, and godly in life, who, after having built up such a character in the foundations of an orthodox faith and having reached a stage of spiritual discernment and fellowship which can dispense with authority, can even find little need of it, give themselves up to views, methods and results that would have been utterly inadequate to production of their own religious experience and which are not only powerless to initiate and foster such experience in others but stand directly in the way of such experience. Having built on accepted foundations a good structure of experience and life they undermine these foundations, forgetting that others will need them.

"The Church's Theological Christ" has long been in disfavor, and is now well nigh demolished. At first we were to pursue this method to reach the historical Jesus, who was the real Christ of God. But now we find that the historical Jesus is as unknown and undiscoverable as all other essential things. So far as we may know Jesus historically, he was so controlled in his own self-consciousness by the type of religious and scientific culture of his time and place, or so limited by the naivitè of the thought of the day; and, furthermore, was so subject to the misrepresentations of the intellectual media of his followers that we can put no reliance on the forms in which he appears in the unhistorical presentations that have come down to us. We are shut up to the acceptance of the utterly unworthy Christ of dogma, or the little less satisfactory Jesus of the remnant of reliable tradition, or to the creation of our own Christ. Come to look at it, the relativity

of all knowledge shuts us up to the self-credited Christ any how, and so we must extricate the eternal principles from the life and words of Jesus and in the light of our larger learning make such a Christ as we must have. So the reasoning goes, and this work is a rather bold and frank statement of it.

It is a gratification to the reader and a credit to the author that Dr. Foster deals frankly with us; "that the reader will find no orthodoxy in this book under the mask of liberalism, and no liberalism under the mask of orthodoxy; but yea is yea and nay is nay," for otherwise we could not "know when he was telling what he believed to be the truth, and when he was holding the truth back for reasons of policy." One could wish that all the writers of this school of thought were equally frank and unequivocal.

There are two attitudes toward the historical data of Jesus. One seeks to find all that it can of fact and is over credulous, while the other wants to find little and is cautious with abandon of the true principles of caution. A third attitude will be more reliable in its results.

Dr. Foster has been dragged into the rationalistic attitude and at length is seeking to walk in its leadership. He has even reached the stage of dogmatic ridicule. "An intelligent man who now affirms his faith in such stories [as the miraculous narratives of the Bible] as actual facts can hardly know what *intellectual* honesty means." Such is the lash of contempt which the scholastic tyranny of the hour holds for all who fail to submit. One had hardly looked to see it wielded by Dr. Foster.

The nine chapters of the work give a good survey of the historical, philosophical and critical relations of the form of Christianity here advocated, and of the view of Jesus—one was about to say lying at its base; but this view of Jesus does not so much lie at the base of this Christianity as it is created for the purpose of being put under the Christianity to give it a semblance of support

in the Christ. We have come already into discussions of "the Christianity of Christ," and the phase of rationalism of which this work is perhaps the best American exponent is frank to admit that it by no means agrees with Jesus's interpretation of himself; it thinks that it values him and knows him far more truly than he knew and esteemed himself. In all sincerity such views and such a system ought not to insist on naming itself after the Christ. It may make what claims it will as a religion and give what credit it will to Jesus for his suggestiveness, but it ought not to call itself Christianity. Christ is Greek for Messiah, and this book ridicules the Messianic idea and ideal.

Our view touches chiefly the discussion of Jesus because that is the matter of chief concern. The philosophic foundations of the discussion belong to that phase of speculation now coming into more distinct form, and which may be described as *personalized pantheism.* Its best exponent is Prof. Borden P. Bowne. Constructive philosophy is now headed in this direction, and its constructive principle is at once true, vigorous and important. It errs in incompleteness, and in its declared and implied negatives. Dr. Foster accepts and uses this philosophy.

W. O. Carver.

Evolution, the Master Key. A Discussion of the Principles of Evolution as Illustrated in Atoms, Stars, Organic Species, Mind, Society and Morals.

By C. W. Saleeby, M. D. (Edin.), Author of "The Cycle of Life." Published by Harper & Bros., London and New York, 1906. Pp. viii. and 364.

This is a considerable volume by one who has been at pains to keep informed of all the progress in scientific research and speculation. That he is also acquainted with metaphysical and religious thought the evidence is wanting. The author is a writer of the *smart* sort that seem ever to be writing between the lines . "Here is wisdom, heed it well." Yet there is a real store of knowledge,

grasp of thought, and insight which do not properly belong to the *smart* writers. The explanation of this combination is not far to seek; he is a devotee of Herbert Spencer. He has imbibed the great philosopher's spirit, exceeds his learning, imitates his comprehensiveness of statement, and pursues after his insight.

He analyzes theories, discusses such as he can, and ridicules the rest. One may think that "henceforth he who doubts that man and the chimpanzee have a common ancestor must be congratulated on his inviolate mind. Facts have no terrors for him," but it is hardly a finality of science when said, especially when the next paragraph must write down Mr. Alfred Russel Wallace as one of the "inviolates." Nor again is he as wise as smart, to speak of "the stupendous impertinence that 'God made man in his own image.' "

The author's reasoning is of that easy sort that follows the laws of logic where this is convenient, but cuts across them or leaps them entirely where this is easier. And yet, for all the strictures, the book is quite readable, and will be very instructive to the man who is not informed of the progress of science along various lines. A glance at the sub-title will partly reveal the comprehensiveness of the view. The short chapters, averaging eleven pages, make the reading easy, even though the style is not free from error.

The main value of the book is its emphasis on the facts that evolution is not self-explanatory; is not progressive toward a perfect goal, and so is dependent on voluntary direction.

W. O. Carver.

The Philosophy of Religion. A Critical and Speculative Treatise of Man's Religious Experience and Development in the Light of Modern Science and Reflective Thinking.

By George Trumbull Ladd, LL.D., formerly Professor of Philosophy in Yale University. Two Vols. Pp. xx and 616 and xii and 590. Published by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1905. Price $7.00 net.

"Truth results from the application of reflective think-

ing to experience facts." As one meditates on that emphatic sentence of the *preface* one finds a description of this *magnum opus.*

The extensive sub-title is unassuming enough, but modestly describes in bold terms the author's work. Its subject, note, is "Man's Religious Experience." By this the author means man's actual experience as contained in multiform and manifold experiences; only experience and all religious experience is to be taken into account. That is not the method of the hour, for science cannot take account of the "supernatural" and remain scientific. But if man has religious experiences that relate themselves, and man, to the supernatural a genuine science, and not its more pretentious pseudonymous shadow, will reckon with even these, and as they are.

But observe the descriptions of the treatise: "Critical and Speculative." *Critical* not in the popular sense of the day, destructively analytical; nor *speculative* in the sense of that guessing so much of which is in circulation under the stamp of "assured results of scholarship." No, here is a man who believes in the value of the mind, and the reliability of its powers and processes. No mere tabulator of phenomena is here, but a thinker who trusts his thought. He does not cut himself off from his age nor ignore, quite, its clamorous spirit for he speaks "in the Light of Modern Science" truly, and no man can charge him with ignorance of modern psychology, history, social science, comparative religion, or Biblical criticism. But he hastens to add "and reflective thinking," a quality by no means essential in the spirit of the learning of the day.

One reviewer has called attention to Dr. Ladd's fearlessness of the Zeitgeist before which so many tremble in awe and bow in subjection. Indeed, the doctor was a man of recognized learning before this Zeitgeist of "Historical Criticism" transferred the seat of his throne from Germany to America. His ground is so sure, his learning so large, his love of truth so great that Dr. Ladd not only

stands forth a man unafraid, but he see nothing to fear. He dismisses the whole "critical" contention that Jesus made no claim to be "Son of Man," and that "Messiahship" was a transient form of thought, in a brief footnote. And the refreshing fact is the "critics" will not poke fun at Dr. Ladd, however they may marvel at his disloyalty. "Reflective thinking" recalls Jonathan Edwards, Noah Porter, Hodge, Locke, Hamilton. And reading this book will carry one deep into fellowship with the reflective thought of the day when that activity was popular.

But of the contents. Volume I may, in a general way, be said to collect the material "in the light of modern science," while Volume II sets forth the "reflective thought." An *Introduction* (82 pp.) gives us the problem, difficulties, presuppositions.

Part I (to p. 258) treats of religion as an historical development. The author denies the popular theories of the origin of religion in magic or mythology, or in "any one lower form of religion," least of all in "irreligious practices." There is no fixed law, and one must recognize the facts as he finds them. The effort is made to fix the laws of development culminating in "obligation to an Ideal."

Part II (pp. 259-481) deals with man as a religious being, showing this in his religious consciousness, relating him, as rational and free, to a god some way the author of his being. Then appears the religious relation to all man's physical and social environment.

Religion: A Life, is the thesis of *Part III* (completing Volume I). The chapters deal successively with faith and dogma, the cult of religion, the way of salvation, the religious community, the individuality of religion, the problem restated.

We are now ready for the reflective speculation. Three topics divide the theme.

Part IV presents God as the object of religious faith. Here is the conception of primary importance. What at-

titude shall one take? Three are possible, "indifferentism, syncretism, agnosticism." Knowledge and faith must be distinguished and related. The customary "proofs" for God are examined and the argument restated. The problem of evil is faced in the light of the moral holiness and perfection of God.

Thus we have been brought already to the test of *Part V*, to consider God in his relation to the world. This calls for consideration of the subject of Pantheism. Then it becomes necessary to discuss the supernatural, and to seek to reconcile the immanency and transcendency of God in the return to the conception of the personal absolute, so strong a note of the rising philosophic thought. Of course evolution must be reckoned with, and all God's relations to men, culminating in the relation of Redeemer. "It is, indeed, no superficial work which suggests the division of all religions into 'religions of salvation, and those that are not. * * * What, then, will remain to humanity? It may try to console itself, and to quench its insatiable thirst for the ideal, with socialistic dreams, imperialistic plans, or selfish strivings for the place of the 'Overman' among the common herd of men. A few may comfort themselves with imaginary constructions of a universal but non-religious altruism. * * * The alternative for a religion is either itself to perish or else actually, but progressively, to effect the redemption of mankind." Sin is fundamental in man's consciousness and calls for redemption. Redemption involves revelation, including inspiration, which must be taken serious account of inasmuch as they constitute notes of all religions." For the history of man's religious evolution is not antithetic to the rational doctrine of a divine self-revealing. On the contrary, the historical view of religion * * * *demands* a doctrine of revelation which shall be so framed as to accord with the historical facts."

Part VI gives the philosopher's answer to the query after the destiny of man. Considering the "permanence

of essentials," the "universality and absoluteness of Christianity" in the light of progress of race culture one cannot anticipate the predicted 'irreligion of the future,' but must look for a final testing of the rival religions when Christianity must appear as the real 'psychic uplift' not of the race alone but of the individual, also issuing in 'the triumph of the divine kingdom' wherein the individual believer will realize his present legitimate 'certainty of immortal life, which admits no doubt, and which feels no lack of joyful assurance."

A noble service, nobly rendered will meet grateful thanks in thinking and believing men. "Science and religion, and philosophy and religion, cannot long refuse to take account of each other's truths. They are all aiming at the One Truth; and this truth must base itself upon, and be understood in the light of, the totality of human experience." "Religion itself is an ever-developing experience. Its object of faith is essentially an ever-expanding Ideal-Real. Therefore any attempt to treat the truths of the religious experience of humanity by the method of philosophy can only terminate in a still imperfect condition of knowledge although in an improved condition of rational faith." *An improved condition of rational faith.* W. O. Carver.

ΛΟΓΙΑ ΙΗΣΟΥ. Sayings of Our Lord from an Early Greek Papyrus.

By B. P. Grenfell, M. A., and A. S. Hunt, M. A. Published by Henry Frowde, Amen Corner, London, E. C., England. 1897.

The Oxyrhynchus Logia and the Apocryphal Gospels.

By the Rev. Charles Taylor, D. D., Master of St. John's College, Cambridge, England. The Clarendon Press, Oxford, England. 1899.

New Sayings of Jesus and Fragment of a Lost Gospel from Oxyrhynchus.

By B. P. Grenfell, D. Litt., M. A. and A. S. Hunt, D. Litt., N. A. Oxford University Press, American Branch, New York, 1904.

The Oxyrhynchus Sayings of Jesus Found in 1903 with the Sayings called Logia Found in 1897.

By the Rev. Chas. Taylor, D. D., L. L. D., Master of St. John's College, Cambridge. The Clarendon Press, Oxford and New York, 1905.

These four books give the facts concerning the famous

discoveries of Drs. Grenfell and Hunt at Oxyrhynchus. In each instance Dr. Charles Taylor, of Cambridge, has issued a little book concerning the discovery, which is one of the sensations of modern New Testament scholarship. Too much credit cannot be given the patience and fidelity of Drs. Grenfell and Hunt who are still editing the Papyri in fast following volumes. More Logia may yet be found. It is now certain that there was a book called Logia of Jesus, though it is not yet settled whether it existed before our Synoptic Gospels or not. Some of these new Sayings have a Gnostic flavor and seem to belong to the second century. The present popular view is that Matthew besides Mark used such a book of Sayings. That is possible though it would not follow that it was the one a few pages of which we now possess. One of the Logia uses ἐντὸς ὑμῶν in a connection where Dr. Taylor says it "must mean that the Kingdom of God is not external but within a man, in his heart." This throws light on Luke 17:21. In simple truth no example of ἐντός in the sense of "among" is known. Let us hope that Drs. Grenfell and Hunt will find yet other leaves of these interesting Logia of Jesus. A. T. Robertson.

The Divine Tragedy. A Drama of the Christ.
By Peyton H. Hoge. Published by the Fleming H. Revell Company New York. Pages 146. Price $1.00 net.

"The Divine Tragedy" tells in blank verse the story of the Christ from the anointing in Bethany to the ascension. The undertaking is such a difficult one that it is easy for a feeling of prejudice to spring up against the author for his presumption—but if so, the frankness and good sense of his "foreword" dispels that and prepares as to read dispassionately and with the reading impression grows that Mr. Hoge has succeeded remarkably well. He has put himself under a proper self-restraint, kept close to the record, and taken pains to maintain historical truth in the details of the various scenes.

It is no small achievement to throw the harmonized

gospel narratives into dramatic form without sacrificing their simplicity and strength, lowering their never-failing dignity or doing violence to our Christian feeling. Rather one feels afresh the power of that old old story to touch the heart and to deepen one's sense of the wickedness of the Jews and the divineness of Jesus, the horror of the cross and the gladness of the resurrection, the sinfulness of one's own heart and the sweetness of the divine forgiveness. Thus the book becomes a benediction, and the author has our thanks. We cordially commend it to all who would see Jesus more clearly and who welcome all that sticks to reverent love and devotion.

J. H. Farmer.

Neutestamentliche Bibelstunden.

Von Dr. H. Hoffman. A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. Leipzig, Germany. Band I (1903). Band II (1904). Band III (1904). Band IV (1903). Band V (1904). To be had also from Lemcke & Buechner, New York.

These five volumes cover the Acts, all of Paul's Epistles, 1 and 2 Peter, and 1 John. There are other volumes to follow. They give the German text with brief comment. The exposition is practical rather than critical. It is a good sample of the work of a scholarly German pastor. Dr. Hoffmann is pastor at Halle. He accepts all of Paul's Epistles as well as 2 Peter. The radical criticism has not carried all before it in Germany when in a great university town like Halle a vigorous pastor can write so firmly and sanely about the books of the New Testament. Ministers who have difficulty with the abstract theological German would find Dr. Hoffmann's style not hard to manage. They would find also many fresh ideas that would be helpful.

A. T. Robertson.

Literary Illustrations of the Bible. The Epistle to the Romans.

By Rev. James Moffatt, D. D. New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son London, Hodder & Stoughton. 1905.

This is a new kind of commentary and a very helpful

one to the busy preacher. There is no analysis, no introduction, no comment by Dr. Moffatt. But to many a verse he adds a lucid saying that illustrates the profound words of Paul. There are also comments on various verses by great writers of the past. Dr. Moffatt has read an amazing amount and to a good purpose. He is himself rather radical in his critical views of the New Testament, as is shown in The Historical New Testament. But he does not show such a bias in his quotations here. The little book will bring real refreshment to many a student.

A. T. Robertson.

Jesus Christ and the Christian Character.

By Francis Greenwood Peabody, Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard University. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1905.

This volume contains the Lyman Beecher Lectures at Yale University in 1904. The author begins his discussion by insisting upon the social mission of Jesus Christ. It is true the regeneration of the social order was to be a by-product of his work rather than the immediate aim of Jesus. Nevertheless the urgent question to be faced by the Christianity of to-day is the Social Question. How then, shall society be saved? The Socialist offers his program; he says change the surroundings and thus improve the individual. Jesus is primarily concerned with the person rather than with the social machinery, though he aims to create characters which will remake the machinery.

The prime consideration is the character of Jesus itself. The author claims that the imitation of Christ is the basis of Christian character. What of the character of Jesus. The ascetic ideal and the aesthetic are both declared inadequate as interpretations of that character. Power is the distinguishing mark of Jesus, intellectual and moral. His vast sympathy and his isolation are the tokens of his power. He communicates in prodigal measure; he is in his inner life in constant relations with the eternal sources of strength.

Next, what is the type of moral character produced by Jesus? The sin he condemned most strongly was spiritual satiety and self-sufficiency. The Pharisee was its living embodiment. The quality he approved most was that of the child, teachableness, docility. Herein lie the roots of Christian character. A conviction for sin, and turning from it is a necessary element in a complete conversion. Here the will, and not merely the emotions or intellect, is chiefly concerned. The teachable spirit and susceptibility to growth, with a consciousness of shortcoming and sin lie at the threshold of Christian character.

Three great words serve to indicate the growth of Christian character according to the teaching of Jesus. The first is righteousness, into which he imported a deeper and richer meaning than it had known. The second word is love, to which Christ gave a new ethical quality. Not the emotions but the will chiefly determines the development of love. Love expresses itself towards individuals, not merely to men in the mass. The other word, more comprehensive than either righteousness or love, embracing both, and particularly emphasized in the fourth Gospel is life. These qualities combine in the character of the Christian to produce power, moral energy, which is capable of enduring suffering, imparting tranquility and peace to others, overcoming circumstances and redeeming the world. It is the supreme need of society to-day.

The author asks next what are the personal consequences of the Christian character? What sort of a person should the Christian be? Tolstoi's view ignores a large part of our Christian social obligation, and Nietsche in his doctrine of the superman fails to understand Christian ideals or the present age. The mark of Christian character is moral power. The body is not to be overcome by asceticism. It must be subdued. The body is not an enemy but an instrument of character. The mind holds not the primacy in moral attainment, our author asserts, but the will. Belief, doctrine, grows out of an

obedient will. The emotions have no moral quality in themselves. The three leading elements of personal Christian character are Poise, which unites various traits; Simplicity, which refers not to the contents but to the direction of the Christian life; Peace, which implies not that the life is sheltered or free from struggle but that it is inwardly tranquil; and Grace which combines the other qualities into a higher unity.

The author sums up the social consequences of the Christian character in three great paradoxes in the teachings of Jesus. First the paradox of self-realization through self-surrender. Second the paradox of service. He who would be first of all and greatest of all must become servant of all. Third the paradox of idealism. The impossible becomes possible, the ideal is the truly real. In these paradoxes Jesus uncovered a new continent of moral values and forces. Society as a whole inevitably comes under their sway when they are embodied in individual character.

The two closing chapters have as their titles "The Ascent of Ethics" and "The Descent of Faith." Under the first head Professor Peabody points out the necessary completion of ethics in religion. Ethics and religion are concentric circles. The frontiers of ethics touch the borders of the large realm of the religious life. Ethics are only relatively complete in themselves. Under the discussion of "the Descent of Faith" the position is maintained that religion of the sane and sound type can never be content with dwelling on the mountain top. It will inevitably descend into the valley of service and practical life. Religion as mere ecclesiasticism, or mysticism, or intellectualism is but fragmentary. Ethics and religion complete each other. The two together constitute a living whole. Particularly in modern life is there need of a return to the ethical side of religion. The principles of Christianity are needed in the home, and in the political and commercial world. The church is guilty of gross neglect if timidly or hesitatingly it faces the ethical issues

and demands forced to the front in our complex and rapidly growing modern life.

In conclusion it may be said that Professor Peabody has given us a fresh and stimulating discussion of a vitally important theme. It is highly important that the ethical teachings of Jesus be understood and applied to the life of to-day and that religion be called back to this part of her sublime task wherever she tends to forget it. And there can be no question that she does too often forget it.

Many will take issue with Professor Peabody on the question of the relation of ethics to religion. These will say we do not come to religion through ethics, but to ethics through religion. They would restate the titles of his closing chapters. Instead of "The Ascent of Ethics" and "The Descent of Faith" they would say "The Ascent of Faith" and "The Descent of Ethics." Christian ethics, in other words, do not blossom into religion, but Christian faith blossoms and points in ethics. And this suggests that Professor Peabody scarcely assigns to Christ his true place and function in relation to ethics. Christ is more than a teacher of ethics. He is an object of faith, and as such creates as well as defines the ethical ideal and life. Every reader, however, will be stimulated and inspired by Professor Peabody's moral earnestness and the strength of his convictions, and will rejoice that he has given us so suggestive and helpful a discussion of a theme of such vast importance. E. Y. Mullins.

II. NEW TESTAMENT.

Jesus.

By W. Bousset. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1906. Pages 211. Price $1.25.

This is another volume in the Crown Theological Library. It is the radical view of Jesus presented with great ability and confidence. The dogmatism of Bousset is refreshing, not in its rarity, for radical and conservative are often dogmatic, but in its vigor and boldness. There is no hesitation with Bousset. He knows all about it. He knows, for instance, that the birth accounts are pure legend, that John the Baptist did not indicate Jesus as the Messiah, that Jesus did not know that he was to die till the very end, that we must "forego all attempts at a formal life or history of Jesus;" (p. 19) that Jesus' mission "was not in any sense expressly Messianic (p. 21), though he thought himself the Messiah (p. 67), that Mark is "preposterous" in making Jesus use parables because the people rejected him (p. 42), that Jesus did not gather a formal band of disciples, that he never gave a "command to carry the Gospel to the Gentiles" (p. 51), that he did not preach a kingdom of the newer life (p. 78), and was mistaken in his ideas about the end (p. 75), that the use of the name at baptism ("actual immersion") "was intended as a protection against the evil spirits working in the world" (p. 109), that Jesus did not institute the Lord's Supper (p. 109), that Jesus did not teach what we have in Matthew 25 about the judgment day (p. 121), etc. In fact, Jesus was a good man and a good teacher, indeed a wonderful teacher, but evidently he missed much—not having Bousset's help! It is pitiful how poorly the Gospels are put together! If they had only had Bousset's redactorial skill! As it is, Bousset can tell what we do not know about the history of Jesus in eighteen short pages. "Only a few scanty data can be established with certainty" (p. 12). For the pure, un-

adulterated article commend us to Bousset. Foster and Schmidt are only disciples, for Bousset is their master. This is the new evangel of ignorance which is to save the people.

Bousset knows finally that Jesus never used the term Son of God about himself (p. 182), that he did call himself Son of Man a few times only (p. 193 f.), that he "never overstepped the limits of the purely human" (p. 202), and "did not thereby place himself on a level with God" (p. 203). Bousset admits that these are "tortuous paths" (p. 195), but he becomes positively offensive when he speaks of the "broodings" of Jesus (p. 195).

A. T. Robertson.

The Book of the Revelation.

By C. Anderson Scott. New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1906. Price $1.25.

Mr. Scott edited the volume on Revelation in the Century Bible, and it was one of the best of the series. The same thing is true of this volume in the Practical Commentary. He is an alert scholar, with a wholesome sanity of outlook. Mr. Scott accepts at most points Prof. Ramsay's view in the Letters to the Seven Churches, but thinks the second beast is not the Provincial Power, but the Priestly Cult. He sees the legend of Nero redivivus in the beast that was, is not, and is to come—a matter by no means certain. The book has many sensible observations, and at once ranks with the best of the commentaries on Revelation.

A. T. Robertson.

The Making of the Gospels. Six Lectures Delivered During Lent, 1905, in Manchester Cathedral.

By Rev. J. J. Scott, M. A., Canon of Manchester. London, John Murray, Albmarle St. West. Pp. 112, paper $1.00 net.

These lectures profess to give a summary of the best English Biblical Criticism. From the facts concerning the four oldest Bibles—the Old Greek Text, the Old Latin and Syriac Versions, and the Diatesseron—the author con-

cludes (1) that the Gospels were written within the period when their reputed authors lived; (2) that the Church was inspired to include all four in her volume of Gospels, and that the authors were inspired what to include in their several works. He dates Mark 63, Matthew and Luke 70, John 96. Mark is accepted as the basis of Matthew and Luke. Their portrait of Christ is his, and his is Peter's. We have only two portraits; the other is John's. Peter's is the Human side; John's the Divine.

The last four lectures deal with the sources, object and characteristics of each of the Gospels. It is refreshing to find Textual Criticism given its proper authority—that is the author's guiding principle. Early true interpretations are referred to the school founded by John at Ephesus. Very interesting is Canon Scott's conjecture of Luke's connection with, and indebtedness to John. More can be said for it than for most of the conjectures one meets with.

The book is popular, very racy and readable, fresh and interesting, and, barring a bit of its churchiness, judicious. One could wish it wide circulation. For it is sane and scholarly, holds close to facts, and confirms faith in the Bible as the Word of God. J. H. Farmer.

Johannine Grammar.

By Edwin A. Abbott. Adam & Charles Black, Soho Square, London, England, 1906. Pages 687. Price 16s. 6d.

This is the most valuable of the six parts of Diatessarica. It is in fact a grammatical commentary of a very high order, and far more helpful than many of the perfunctory commentaries. Here an effort is made to understand the language of the writer. There are many significant things in John's Gospel such as his use of terms, his repetitions, his use of the pronouns, his prepositions, his use of καί, so often and to mean "and yet," his use of ἵνα, etc. In this volume also Dr. Abbott's rich scholarship comes out with fine originality. He has not simply read widely, he has ideas in abundance on a multitude

of interesting points, and they are always worth considering. This volume can be cordially commended to any scholarly man who is anxious to go deeply into the Gospel of John. It is indispensable to the trained student who wishes to get all the fresh knowledge from linguistic research. We may have a Pauline Grammar next, but, if it is as good a piece of work as this Johannine Grammar, it will be cordially welcomed. One is astonished again at the virility in turning out so many books of such excellent quality in so short a time. No student of Gospel problems can neglect Diatessarica. A. T. Robertson.

Johannine Vocabulary.

By Edwin A. Abbott. Adam & Charles Black, Soho Square, London, England, 1905. Price 13s, 6d. Pages 353.

This volume is Volume V in Diatessarica, a series of six books on Gospel problems. The four preceding ones are Clue, The Corrections of Mark, From Letter to Spirit, Paradosis. It is positively amazing to me the amount of detail that Dr. Abbott has so accurately put together in this volume. He has done original thinking at every turn. The words of the Fourth Gospel are compared with those of the Synoptic Gospels. As examples of his careful work one notes the discussion of πιστεύω and ἐξουσία. "Believe" in John has several senses. The chapter on Johannine Synonyms is especially suggestive and helpful. Dr. Abbott has a spirited style and maintains the interest right through. The book will be useful to all students of John's Gospel. Dr. Abbott's Diatessarica will make a thesaurus for technical students of the Gospels. A. T. Robertson.

The History of Early Christian Literature. The Writings of the New Testament.

By Baron Herman Von Soden, D. D. Translated by the Rev. J. R. Wilkinson, M. A. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1905. Pages 476. Price $1.25.

This book belongs to the Crown Theological Library. The series is a set of handbooks that expound the liberal

and even radical view of Christianity. This work by Von Soden is very ably done. The style is clear, and he has a vigorous grasp of his theme. He is best in his discussion of Paul. He rejects the Pastoral Epistles and the Gospel of John and other N. T. books. He conceives that the Revelation of John (early date) incorporates a Jewish Apocalypse. His criticism is keen, direct and frank. There is no mistaking the position that he takes. Certainly this reviewer disagrees with him at a great many points, but he has been glad to read this able statement of the views of the radical school of criticism. He hits hard, but he has a right to do that. A. T. Robertson.

Christian Origins.

By Otto Pfleiderer, D. D. New York, B. W. Huebach, 1906. Pp. 296

This book is translated by Rev. D. A. Huebsch. It is Pfleiderer's characteristic style. He is cock-sure about everything, and can lightly set aside any passage of Scripture which conflicts with his theories. Pfleiderer rules out the supernatural and endeavors to explain Christianity purely as a natural development. He has great mental force, but is so unscrupulous in the use of the sources that one can have little confidence in him.

A. T. Robertson.

Nageli, Der Wortschatz der Apostels Paulus.

Vandenhroeck & Ruprecht, Goettingen, Germany. To be had also through Lemcke & Buechner, New York, 1905.

This book is part of a lexicon to Paul, which it is hoped the author will finish. We have now a Johannine Grammar, why not a Pauline Lexicon, if not grammar? Nageli only uses the letters α—ϵ, but he has given us a very careful and helpful study. He has made use of the inscriptions and the papyri to fine effect. Some day Thayer must be revised, and this work will help it on.

A. T. Robertson.

Jesus und die Rabbinen.

Von Dr. Erich Bischoff. J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig, Germany, 1905. M. 2. 20. Gebunden M. 3. S. 114. To be had also of Lemcke & Buechner, New York.

This is a very careful comparison between the teaching of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount and that of the Rabbis as reported in the Talmud. So far from proving the dependence of Christ on the Rabbis for his distinctive ideas, Dr. Bischoff insists that the Rabbis made use of the New Testament. Besides in the mouth of Jesus kingdom of heaven had a far deeper sense than in the Old Testament or the Talmud. This scholarly study of the words of the Sermon on the Mount will repay any earnest student of the teaching of Jesus. A. T. Robertson.

An Analysis of the Gospel of John, with Notes.

By Frederick L. Anderson, D. D.. Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Newton Theological Institution, Newton Centre, Mass. Pages 23.

The cover page states in addition that this was prepared for the Rhode Island Committee of Pastors. In it Professor Anderson has done a helpful work for others than the Rhode Island pastors. In a concluding note he asserts his increased confidence in the trustworthiness of the Fourth Gospel as history. But he regards it as primarily a philosophical work, "the results of reflection on the character and words of Jesus." The inner thought of this philosophical work he traces "by certain characteristic and typical words," Glory, Light, Father, Son, Believe, World, Truth, Testify, Life, Judgment, etc., and the analysis is stated in relation to these words. To have followed "their lead" is what the author claims as his own contribution to his subject. To have shown the importance of these words as clues to the thought must be helpful to the student of this Gospel; and, even if later discussions shall show that they are controlling in discovering the writer's thought, this analysis must still be helpful to any diligent student. It is to be hoped that it may be widely used. D. F. Estes.

A Grammar of New Testament Greek.

By James Hope Moulton. Vol. I. Prolegomena. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh; Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1906. Pages 274.

This volume marks a new era in the study of New Testament Greek. The era had come before and produced this Grammar. The two chief characteristics of the new grammatical study of the New Testament are the use of the papyri and inscriptions and the application of comparative philology to the New Testament language. Dr. Moulton has long been a specialist in comparative grammar at Cambridge University, and along with Deissmann has done most to investigate the bearing of the newly discovered papyri vernacular on the New Testament Greek. He is the son of Dr. W. F. Moulton, the English translator and editor of Winer. The Winer-Moulton has for over a generation been the standard New Testament grammar in Britain as the Winer-Thayer is in this country. This brilliant work of Prof. J. Hope Moulton will at once supplant the Winer-Moulton, and will be a necessity for the scholarly student of the New Testament. This volume gives the bulk of the new light of an introductory nature that Prof. Moulton has to offer, and it makes fascinating reading. But let no one think that because it is interesting, it is not scholarly. There is a wealth of the best modern scholarship with all a scholar's painstaking accuracy. Dr. Moulton is now Tutor of New Testament Greek at Didsbury College, Manchester, and is pushing ahead the second and main volume of the grammar. When that appears he will commemorate a magnificent achievement. As it is, I propose to use the Prolegomena of Moulton next session instead of Winer. If I had known several years ago what Dr. Moulton was doing I probably should not myself have undertaken the task of making a New Testament grammar. As it is, I can only go on to the end. But I rejoice heartily that, whatever fate awaits my humble performance, the world has already a New Testament Greek grammar that is up-to-date and adequate for modern needs. Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht

tell me that they have engaged Prof. Schwyzer to join hands with Prof. Schmiedel in the completion of the Winer-Schmiedel revision. Schwyzer is an expert in the κοινή and will add distinctly to the value of the Schmiedel revision.

But I cannot close this brief review without expressing again the enthusiasm that I feel for Moulton's Prolegomena. It fairly bristles with life and interest. Get it and read it, and go at your Greek New Testament with fresh energy. A. T. Robertson.

Histoire des livres du Nouveau Testament.

Par M. l'abbe E. Jacquier, professeur d'Ecriture sainte aux Facultes catholiques de Lyon. Tome Premier. 1 vol. in 12, de ix-495 pages de la *Bibliotheque de l'enseignement de l'histoire ecclesiastique.* Prix: 3 fr. 50. Librairie Victor Lecoffre, rue Bonaparte, 90, Paris.

Histoire des livres du Nouveau Testament.

Par M. l'abbe E. Jacquier, professeur d'Ecriture Sainte aux Facultes catholiques de Lyon. Tome second: *Les evangiles synoptiques.* 1 vol. in-12 de 511 pages: Prix: 3 fr 50. Librairie Victor Lecoffre, rue Bonapare, 90, Paris.

These are both new editions of the excellent volumes of Abbe Jacquier. He is a scholarly Roman Catholic, and, while conservative, is fully abreast of the new scholarship. He has the best ideas from every source in order to make these manuals helpful. There is an excellent spirit in the author. He is not always pugnacious, but is constantly constructive and aims to give a positive picture of the New Testament books. These volumes are not studies in the New Testament Canon, but rather historical and exegetical expositions of the various books with copious critical comments on numerous matters of interest. There is much of the characteristic French alertness and lightness of touch. These volumes serve as a good illustration of the conservative element in modern French Romanism in contrast to Abbe Loisy. Abbe Jacquier is not merely traditional. He gives a good account for his loyalty to the New Testament books, and his volumes are full of rich suggestions. He writes with vividness and force. A. T. Robertson.

III. SERMONS.

The Unlighted Lustre. Addresses from a Glasgow Pulpit.

By the Rev. S. H. Morison, M. A. Pages, 278. New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son.

There are thirty sermons in this collection, each good and fit for its place. One thing to note is that they are really sermons, personal and persuasive. The subjects are fresh and freshly stated, "The Unlighted Lustre," "The Intrusiveness of Christ," "The League with the Stones," "Hands Beautiful." As a rule, too, they are markedly Scriptural. The acquaintance with literature displayed is wide and varied, but the Bible is more to the author than other books, and he has read it for himself with his own eyes, and not another's. To be sure, these are not great sermons. They do not set forth the profoundest truths of the Book, nor search the depths of the soul, nor grapple with the greatest problems of life today; but they might well stimulate many a preacher to emulation by their almost breezy freshness, their directness and simplicity, their wealth of allusion, their variety and fertility, and their consequent attractiveness.

D. F. Estes.

The Essentials of Spirituality.

By Felix Adler. Pages 92. New York. James Pott & Co.

This volume, made up of four addresses before the Ethical Culture Society of New York City, of which Dr. Adler has been the leader from the beginning, deserves wide and thoughtful reading. We may not agree that his definition of spirituality, "always keeping in view this supreme end" of moral completeness, of perfection, exactly expresses our idea of spirituality; but it were to be hoped that we all agreed with the author in devotion to this purpose. What he says as to living in view of death and as to our attitude toward our fellow men deserves not

reading only, but re-reading and repetition. Of course, the teachings of Dr. Adler must be limited by his failure to accept Christianity, but it is also to be recognized that he feels and says some things which many who have the Christian faith are neglecting. This little book of ethical culture addresses may well evoke and enrich many Christian sermons. D. F. Estes.

The Certainty of the Kingdom, and other Sermons. By Heber D. Ketcham, D. D., Pages 152. Cincinnati, Jennings & Rat. 50 cents net.

The preacher of these sermons publishes them "that the ways of God in the heart of man may be made plain." Doubtless by the preaching of them souls were helped, and it is to be hoped that the same result may attend them as printed; but this is not certain. The author laments the confusion of the definitions which state "the processes of grace in Christian experience." It can hardly be said that he has escaped a similar confusion. These discourses are earnest in tone, not specially simple in style, indeed sometimes almost turgid, rather forceful than clear, showing no keen discrimination either in acceptance of historical statements or in analysis of human emotions, but demonstrating the author's loyalty to Christ, and also his soundness in Wesleyan doctrine, as befits a Methodist preacher. D. F. Estes.

✓ **The Christ of Today.** What? Whence? Whither? By G. Campbell Morgan. Pages 64. Fleming H. Revell Co.

In this little book, presumably the printing of an address, the "Problem of Jesus" is stated once more, and once more in a way that ought to be effective. The author argues on the basis of four "facts of the hour, embedded in the consciousness of enlightened people." "Christ is the Revealer of the highest type of human life . . . the Redeemer of all types of human failure . . . Ruler over the most remarkable empire that man has ever seen . . . the Restorer of lost order wherever he is

obeyed." "If you grant me the Christ who is Revealer, Redeemer, Ruler, Restorer, I claim that he is the Christ of the virgin birth, the virtuous life, the vicarious dying, the victorious resurrection," "the Christ of history . . . and the Christ of the New Testament writers." All this is helpfully developed, and then the question "Whither?" is briefly discussed in the fullest assurance that the Christ of to-day who is the Christ of yesterday shall to-morrow fully triumph. It is a pity that two pages are marred by the blunder "Vie de Jesu" as the title of Renan's book, for nowhere is absolute accuracy, even in proof reading, more important than in apologetic works. D. F. Estes.

The Church and the Times. Sermons.

By the Rev. Robert Francis Coyle, D. D., Moderator of the 115th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York. 1905. Price $1.50.

This collection of fifteen sermons takes its name from the first, but the name is appropriate to the entire collection. They are a product of the large city and have no vision beyond its soot and grime. The diagnosis of society is the diagnosis of city society, and is, therefore, decidedly too somber for American society at large. It is one of the faults of most of the literature, both religious and secular, of our time. The great world beyond the city is almost forgotten. The author pleads for evangelism but shows little of it himself in these sermons. The Bible is little used except as a quarry for texts, and one could very well label some of these sermons, "Lectures on Sociology." They lack fervor and spiritual power. The style is simple, matter of fact, but devoid of grace and beauty. W. J. McGlothin.

IV. MISSIONS.

Buddhist and Christian Gospels, Being Gospel Parallels from Pali Texts, Now First Compared from the Originals.

By Albert J. Edmunds. Third and complete edition, edited with parallels and notes from the Chinese Buddhist Tripitaka, by M. Anesaki, Professor of the Science of Religion in the Imperial University of Tokyo. Published in Tokyo by the Yuhokwan Publishing House. 1905. For sale in America by the Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago. Pp. XIII, IV, 230. Price $1.50.

The author, in ways explained in the prefaces, became enamored of studies of the *Sacred Books of the East* and of *New Testament sources,* for which he seems not to have had sufficient preparation, adequate skill, nor ample opportunity. He has made the most of his chance and deserves recognition for his results; a recognition which he complains came tardily, for in prefacing the *second edition* he said: "The publication of historical works is very difficult in this age of ephemera. The only genuine publishers are governments, universities and learned societies, together with a very few commercial firms that have men of learning at their head. Not having any influence with the first three, and having sought in vain to find the last * * * I am compelled, etc." He adds: "But while the commercial world ignores a work of research, scholars accord it recognition." We are thus prepared for the buoyant hilarity with which Mr. Edmunds at last finds full and appreciative sympathy in Professor Anesaki, and brings out this *complete edition* with happy gratitude to "all those who have helped me, not forgetting the fair wielders of that convenient instrument, the typewriter."

"The present work is part of a larger one, viz.: *Cyclopaedia Evangelica; an English Documentary Introduction to the Four Gospels,*" of which the author feels he "may truly say it is my life work."

The author avers that "no borrowing is alleged on either side—Christian or Buddhist—in these parallels.

We offer no theory but present them as facts. They at least belong to a world of thought which the whole East had in common." This language already betrays rather distinct theory. It speedily becomes evident, and the evidence multiplies, that the author does atttribute borrowing. Besides numerous other marks of a theory we find on p. 48 a list of seven "incidents * peculiar or original to Luke, * * nearly all demonstrably fiction," and on p. 49 we read: "Luke then, who aimed to make the Gospel universal, as Paul had done, was influence [d] by the Buddhist epic, but did not slavishly copy it."

Comparing Christ and Buddha, pp. 51-2, the author makes one the apostle of the heart, the other of the head and refers to the efforts "to fill up the deficiences of the Master's." "All is so far imperfect." Both these must be taken into account while we await "the Christ-Metteyyo * * the prophet of a perfect balance between mind and heart * * * for whom the ages wait."

Theoretically, Mr. Edwards, recognizes the crude and uncritical state of the Buddhist literature telling us: "After a hundred years of hard work by Pali scholars, Chinese, Tibetan and Singhalese, we may hope to arrive at a scientific understanding of the Buddhist Holy Writ such as we are now arriving at as regards the Christian," but practically this significant fact puts no check or modification on the methods and little on the conclusions of the work. The actual Parallels are classified under the several "Parts:" Infancy Legends; Initiation and Commencement; Ministry and Ethics; The Lord; Closing Scenes, the Future of the Church, Eschatology. The editor has added the Chinese text wherever it is found to correspond and by various notes and marks thrown light on the process. Some interesting conclusions are suggested by the variations between the Pali and Chinese texts but neither the American nor the Japanese contributor has taken note of them.

The work is of interest to any student of this subject.

A number of errors will doubtless find correction in the next edition. W. O. Carver.

The Moslem Doctrine of God. An Essay on the Character and Attributes of Allah according to the Koran and Orthodox Tradition.

By Samuel M. Zwemer, Author of "Arabia, the Cradle of Islam," "Raymond Lull," etc. Published by American Tract Society. Pp. 120.

This "essay" shows that breadth of scholarship, profound thought, accurate discrimination and moral earnestness which all who have read this author's works have learned to expect of him. His thirteen years of missionary service in Arabia have been sufficient to place him in the forefront of devoted and scholarly missionaries.

This little volume sets forth with convincing clearness the poverty and lack of morality in the Moslem conception of Allah. He agrees with the view now growing in form that Mohammed willfully neglected and misrepresented the Christian theology.

Mr. Zwemer does not allow himself to be deceived by superficially reading Christian concepts into Mohammedan terms and phraseology, but by a thoroughly scientific method arrives at the Moslem concept in the theological term, a concept barren and disappointing enough. Only thus can we understand the faith of Islam.

A summary chart, giving an "Analysis of Islam as a system developed from its creed," is interesting and valuable. W. O. Carver.

Jesus und Budda.

Vortrag, gehalten von Prof. D. Fritz Barth an einem akademischen diskussions abeud in Bern den 4 Juli, 1905. Preis M. 35 Pf. 12 pages.

A brief, clear summary outline of the correspondence in history, person and teaching of Jesus and Buddha, and a vigorous presentation of the exalted superiority of Jesus and the influence of his divine personality.

W. O. Carver.

Der Koran.

Eine Apologie des Evangelinous, von Abr. Amirchanjouz, Missionor in Vorna (Bulgarieu). Gutersloh, Druch und Verlag von C. Bertlesmann. 1905.

This tractate, 45 pages, "carries the war into Africa." It is a vigorous attack on the morality and religious worth of the Koran. It proceeds in a scholarly way, the author seeming to be familiar not only with the Koran but with the critical discussions of it. He supports his charges by actual quotations and incisive interpretation. Too long, perhaps, has Carlisle's lead been followed in flattering interpretations of Mohammedanism. A reaction has come not among missionaries alone, or primarily, but among scholars as well. Let it not go too far.

W. O. Carver.

Wissenschaftliche und Religiose Wetlansicht.

Ein Vortrag von Marcel T. Djuvara Gottengen, Vanderboeck & Ruprecht, 1906. Received through Lemcke & Buechner, 11 East 17th St New York.

This discourse of 39 pages is an interesting and suggestive effort to point the way of reconciliation between scientific and religious knowledge. The author sees as the one way the Kantian method of reconciling the *pure reason* and the *practical reason* through *logic*. Religious knowledge represents transcendental truth, scientific knowledge *empirical truth*. Faith when properly understood is independent of science. If now one shall avoid the errors of phenomenalism, and abstraction and will recognize the relativity and actuality of knowledge at the same time the conflict can be harmonized.

All of which might be theoretically true, but is practically useless, even as Kant's critiques never quite met the demand of practical thinking and acting, to say the least.

W. O. Carver.

V. OLD TESTAMENT.

The Higher Critcism Cross-Examined. An Appeal and a Warning.

By F. D. Storey. The Griffith & Rowland Press, Philadelphia, 1905. Price $1.25, postpaid $1.35.

Every Bible student who has been disturbed by the growth of radical criticism would find this book interesting and informing. A sane and reverent layman who has taken the time to inform himself in a general way as to the history and methods of modern Higher Criticism, tests the critical processes by which the books of the Bible have been dismembered, and shows that such logical processes would not be tolerated in a court of justice.

"The assumption of the critic to act in so many diverse, not to say incompatible capacities, is one which is surely open to serious question, if not to absolute ridicule. He is, first of all, an expert, a specialist in his own line—usually a man with a theory to support. His place is the witness box, and it is his to testify to the facts; and those who have been in any degree familiar with the course of legal procedure in recent years will know that of all classes of evidence expert testimony is regarded by the courts as least trustworthy, as most open to suspicion, and as calling for the severest scrutiny. Indeed, the cases are rare in which standing alone the opinions of experts (and their testimony seldom amounts to more), would be regarded as a sufficient basis for judicial action. The critic is then a witness; or, if you would stretch his functions to the utmost limit of legitimacy, he is also an advocate to press by argument his theory as to the facts upon the court. But he is not satisfied even with this double role. He must ascend the bench, and by his charge as judge throw the weight of the court's authority into the scale in his own favor; then as jury render a verdict in accordance with his original testimony; and finally, as sheriff, execute the sentence of dismemberment im-

posed by the court. A most convenient, short-cut method this, and one calculated to discourage overmuch controversy. In the ordinary walks of life such all-embracing pretentions are rarely encountered, and when they are the pretender is naturally overwhelmed with deserved ridicule. To find an exact parallel one would have to resort to the pages of comic opera, where Pooh Rah was not only the Mikado's prime minister, but also held every other office in sight that was worth having."

The literary and historical canons of the divisive critics are subjected to tests that a plain man can understand. It becomes manifest to the reader that the modern critical positions have been attained, not so much through a revival of Hebrew learning, as through the application of philosophical assumptions which the Christian scholars of the past could not accept. The effort to bolster up these anti-supernaturalistic assumptions by literary and historical arguments is subjected by Mr. Storey to the most rigorous and outspoken criticism. The author, even when tempted to apply the lash to men using unequal critical balances, always observes the courtesies of debate. The sane, vigorous, timely discussion ought to have a wide reading. It is the kind of book the advocates of destructive criticism never try to answer; they will simply ignore it.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

The Bible and Modern Criticism.

By Sir Robert Anderson. Hodder & Stoughton, London, Fifth Edition, 1905. Pages 281.

Sir Robert Anderson is a free lance in Bibilical Criticism. He applies epithets that sting wherever they are deserved. Of course he is not in this respect introducing a new attitude into the discussion of critical questions, for the divisive critics have often applied opprobrious epithets to their more conservative associates in the field of Biblical research. With Sir R. Anderson's advance criticism of the Greek text adopted by the Canterbury revisers this reviewer has no sympathy; and the author's

views of the prophetic future seem open to criticism. But, as a challenge to the divisive critics to submit their processes and results to the tests applied by men in courts of law and in the business world, this book has a mission. One reviewer found the book so interesting that he read it through at one sitting. JOHN R. SAMPEY.

The Codes of Hammurabi and Moses.

By W. W. Davies, Ph. D. Jennings & Graham, Cincinnati. Pages 125. Price 75 cents net.

This is easily the most convenient manual on the Code of Hammurabi. The text of the Code is given in Small Pica type, the parallels from the Old Testament in Long Primer, while the author's notes are printed in Brevier type. The book is thus a delight to the eye. Dr. Davies has made good use of the best work of the specialists in Assyriology. He has appended indices that greatly increase the usefulness of the manual. Bible students everywhere ought to have the book.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

Bible History [Old Testament] after the Results of Historical Criticism. Arranged for Students of Different Ages.

By Pastor X. Koenig. Translated from the French by Mary Louise Hendee. 1905, McClure, Phillips & Co., New York.

In the introduction the author says: "It is the aim of this little book, which we confidently offer to Bible students and teachers, to help restore the Bible to the unique place it ought to hold in every Protestant family; and it is also its aim to testify to the fact, that historical criticism, far from having 'demolished' the Bible, has, by subjecting it to tests used in establishing the validity of other documents of antiquity, eliminated a great part of the difficulties it presents in the face of modern thought, and made it yield up more of its grandeur and significance, as the priceless document of the progressive revelation of God for the salvation of suffering men." In an-

other connection he remarks: "We recognize the fact that there are myths and legends in the Bible, and we do not fear to acknowledge that it is sometimes difficult, if not impossible, to disengage the true history from the legends in which it is buried. Before this frank avowal, Voltaire is disarmed." The question arises in the mind of the reader whether Voltaire, if he were alive, would care to take up arms against such a naturalistic view of the Bible as this little book presents. Thus the author holds that the narratives of the lives of the patriarchs are absolutely legendary. He would draw moral and spiritual lessions from legendary material, and would explain the presence of such legends in the Old Testament on the ground that our Lord himself used fiction in his remarkable parabolic teachings.

The book contains selections from all parts of the Old Testament Scriptures. In circles in which the Bible is no longer read this little manual might call attention to the charm and beauty of the Scriptures; in circles where the Bible is studied as the priceless Word of God such a book would be absolutely worthless.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

An Introduction to the Old Testament.

By John Edgar McFadyen, M. A. Octo., cloth. Pages 356. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York, 1905.

For a reasonably brief and attractive presentation of the so-called advanced criticism of the Old Testament we know of no volume that is superior to this work by Prof. McFadyen. The author avows his chief purpose in the discussion to make an interesting book. In this he seems to have succeeded. On almost every page we have encountered statements which were either questionable or from our point of view manifestly untrue. With the philosophical assumptions at the bases of the book we have little sympathy. It seems to us that for the young minister to begin his study of the Old Testament with this manual as a guide would be exceedingly unfortunate.

He would almost inevitably take a lower view of the Old Testament revelation than the Biblical writers took. The author tries to reassure himself and his readers by remarking: "Traditional opinions on questions of date and authorship may have been shaken or overthrown, but other and greater things abide; and not the least precious is that confidence, which can now justify itself at the bar of the most rigorous scientific investigation, that, in a sense altogether unique, the religion of Israel is touched by the finger of God." It has always seemed to some of us who have for many years studied the Old Testament that on many occasions in the sacred history Jehovah made bare his mighty arm. Even the magicians of Egypt reluctantly admitted in connection with the third plague that this was the finger of God. Surely the devout Christian scholar ought to be able to go further than this.

The fondness for discovering discrepancies and contradictions in the text of Scripture leads Prof. McFayden and others of his school to manufacture difficulties where the ordinary intelligent reader would never suspect them. Thus, in the account of the capture of Jericho our author remarks: "In one version Israel marches six days silently around the city and on the seventh they shout at the word of Joshua; in the other, they march around seven times in one day and the seventh time they shout at the blast of the trumpet." To the reader not looking for discrepencies it would seem that the account marches straightforward with perfect consistency. Our author can be sufficiently liberal upon occasion. Thus he quotes a statement in Joshua 27:11, "the men of Jericho *fought* against you," to show that the account in the earlier part of Joshua is a poetical narrative, omitting all details of the struggle which must have taken place at the capture of the city.

Our author accepts the newest phase of the radical criticism, which would convert J, E, D, and P of Hexateuchal criticism into schools of writers and editors.

Thus he says: "The documents J, E and P, which, for convenience, we have treated as if each were the product of a single pen, represent in reality movements which extended over decades and even centuries." Thus each of these alphabetical symbols comes to stand for a number of individuals living in diffeernt generations and centuries. The author's sober judgment asserts itself in the remark that "though they stand for undoubted literary facts, it is altogether futile to attempt, on this basis, an analysis of the entire document into its component parts." Nearly every book in the Old Testament, according to Prof. McFadyen, has received accretion from the hands of post-exilic redactors. Whenever there is need of a new editor he is immediately forthcoming. If conservative scholars could summon spirits from the vasty deep with equal success, we might leave it to disembodied spirits to fight the battles of criticism to a finish.

Our author is exceedingly fond of identifying similar events as duplicate accounts of the same event. If difficulties confront him in the identification, he falls back upon the fact that there are many other unmistakable duplicates as justifying the fusing of two separate narratives into one. He has attempted to make the Amalekite's story of Saul's death another version of that event differing from the one given by the author of I. Samuel 31. In some instances widely different conceptions are taken as a mark of widely different ages, while in others the fact of difference is not pressed.

We have found the author's treatment of the Prophets engaging in style, but exceedingly unsatisfactory in its minimizing of the predictive element in the Old Testament. Most of the great Messianic prophecies are transported bodily to the exilic and post-exilic periods, though they often seem to be firmly imbedded in their present context in the roll of the Prophets. Prof. McFadyen takes a rather low view of the author of Isaiah,

chapters 40 to 55. "Isaiah mounts upon wings as an eagle; the later prophet neither mounts nor runs, he walks—XL.: 31. He has not the older prophet's majesty; he has a quiet dignity, and his tone is more tender." Having referred to the prophet's doctrine of approaching fulfillment of the words of ancient prophecy, our author adds: "This very attitude to prophecy marks the book as late; it would not be possible in a pre-exilic prophet." In view of the great extent of time between Samuel and the early prophets and the period of Isaiah, this remark would seem to be a rather bold assertion. The disposition to dump into the late exilic and the post-exilic periods all the noblest literature of Israel has always seemed to the present reviewer exceedingly uncritical. It is quite convenient, of course, for those who wish to eliminate supernatural prediction from the prophetic rolls, but for one who can with perfect intellectual self-respect think of the Old Testament as Jesus and the Apostles did such a view seems to mix in inextricable confusion the entire Old Testament. Prof. McFadyen is skillful in sugar-coating the drastic critical medicine which he hopes to dispense among the theological students of our day. We would respectfully recommend to these young ministers a very careful study of the Old Testament as we have it in the American Standard Revision before they undertake to swallow large doses of the patent medicine of radical criticism.

The Prophets and the Promise.

By Willis Judson Beecher. D. D. Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., New York, 1905. Pages 427. Price $2.00 net.

This book is for substance the lectures for 1902-3 on the L. P. Stone foundation in the Princeton Theological Seminary. "The presentation it makes is essentially a restatement of the Christian tradition that was supreme fifty years ago, but a restatement with differences so numerous and important that it will probably be regarded, by men who do not think things through, as an at-

tack on that tradition." Dr. Beecher goes on to say: "I have tried to make my search a search for the truth, without undue solicitude as to whether its results are orthodox; but it seems to me that my conclusions are simply the old orthodoxy, and with some new elements introduced by widening the field of the induction."

Dr. Beecher makes several valuable preliminary statements as to the right method of approach to the subject. He insists on a careful study of the Old Testament itself. "In Old Testament studies, the thing now more needed than anything else is a more correct knowledge of what the Old Testament says." He holds that the proper method is to begin with a direct examination, and not with a cross-examination. The statements of the sacred writers, apart from any acceptance of the doctrine of inspiration, ought to be previously adopted. "We shall surely test the dates as we advance. If they are not trustworthy, we shall find it out. If they are trustworthy, we shall see them to be so, and shall thus transform our provisional results into final results."

Eisegesis, whether of ideas imported from the New Testament on the one hand or from theories of Comparative Religion on the other, is to be sedulously avoided. "We are to go to the Old Testament to find what is there, and not to find what we suppose ought to be there." Dr. Beecher reminds us that many modern scholars are so afraid of reading into the Old Testament more recent truth that does not belong there that they actually expel from it, in their interpretations, some of its simplest and most evident teachings. The author thinks that the true method is to come to any given Old Testament passage with the question, What did this mean to an intelligent, devout, uninspired Israelite of the time to which it belongs? "The givers of the message claim to be inspired, but it was to uninspired though thoughtful men that the message was immediately directed."

In the first part of his book Professor Beecher treats

of the Prophets, and in the second part he discusses the Messianic Promise. We thus learn much about the men through whom the Promise was given before following the author in a careful study of the elements that enter into the Messianic doctrine.

The terms for prophet, seer, prophecy, burden, vision, etc., are set forth according to the usage of the sacred writers. The author remarks, "Follow what critical theory you please, there is a somewhat extensive vocabulary of prophetic terms from a time as early as the earliest surviving records of the earliest times in Israelitish history." Dr. Beecher does not believe that the different Hebrew terms for prophet were sharply differentiated; for Samuel was both a *roeh* and a *nabhi,* and Gad was both a *hhozed* and a *nabhi.* "With perhaps some limitation in the case of *roeh* and *hhozeh,* a person who was regarded as having certain supernatural gifts was called indifferently man of God, prophet, seer, beholder. One term may have been at certain times current, rather than another, the term *roeh,* for example, just before the prophetic revival under Samuel, but all four of the terms were current from very early times."

Dr. Beecher, in tracing the external history of the Old Testament prophets, makes the first period close with the death of Eli; the second period extending from Samuel to the close of the Old Testament. He finds in the first great period prior to the death of Eli the words "prophet" and "prophesy" employed not less than twenty-four times. There are also other words indicating the reception of supernatural revelation from Jehovah. As to these early organs of revelation the author uses a convenient term to separate them from Samuel and the succession of prophets to the close of the Old Testament. He remarks, "If we distinguish between prophets and prophetic men, applying the latter term to men who had prophetic gifts, but are better known in some other capacity, the great names before Samuel are of prophetic men only." Dr. Beecher rightly opposes

the notion that I. Samuel 9:9 affirms that the word "prophet" was new in Israel when this narrative was written, and that neither the word nor the fact had ever before been known. "The writer contemplates prophecy, both the word and the fact, as a gift to Israel which had been interrupted but was now restored, and not at all as a new gift which had never till now been bestowed. In this he agrees with the writers of the earlier history, who speak of prophets as existing at least from the times of Abraham."

Dr. Beecher conceives of the prophet as a citizen with a message. He thinks there was no regular prophetic costume; the man is everything, and his dress nothing. Nor were the prophetic companies bands of whirling dervishes. The prophet did not as a rule receive any anointing at the hands of men, but became a prophet through the call of God. Jehovah chose true and brave men for the prophetic office. "A distinguishing thing in the religion of Israel is its proclamation *that a man is the truest channel of communication between man and God.*"

Professor Beecher divides the functions of a prophet into those which require distinctly supernatural gifts, and those which do not require such gifts. Under the head of naturalistic functions he would include the work of the prophets as statesmen, always opposed to all entangling alliances with foreign powers; as reformers, rebuking injustice and immorality; as evangelistic preachers and organizers, preaching the cardinal duties of repentance and faith; and as literary men preserving all sorts of valuable information. Other gifted men in all ages and countries have shown kindship to the prophets in these departments of exalted endeavor. But the prophets also exercised distinctly supernatural powers: "the working of miracles, the disclosing of secrets, the fortelling of events, the revealing of Yahweh's law, the teaching of the doctrine of the Messiah."

Dr. Beecher believes that the prophets received their

message from the inspiring Spirit. "In fine, this Spirit that inspires the prophets is presented to us as a unique being, having personal characteristics, effluent from Yahweh the Supreme Spirit of the Universe, at once identical with and different from Yahweh." As to the modes of revelation to the prophets, he prefers a new classification: "first, dreams; second, picture-visions; third, visions of insight; fourth, theophanies."

What was the relation of the prophet to the law? The Hebrew noun *torah* and its verb *horah,* according to our author, "are never used of teaching or instruction merely in the sense of giving information. Always they denote authoritative teaching," thus corresponding very nearly with the current idea of divine revelation. Professor Beecher opposes the view that there was a priestly *torah* and a prophetic *torah.* "They were both teachers of *torah,* but the prophet was, in addition, the revealing agent through whom the *torah* was given." The prophetic *torah* was a growing aggregate, a body of literature that continually enlarged its boundaries while revelation lasted. The *torah* is thus wider than the Pentateuch, and Ezra 6: 18 shows that the additions to the Levitical law that were made in the days of David were grouped with the regulations of the Sinaitic legislation as forming part of the book of Moses. The later rabbinical exaltation of the Pentateuch above the other Old Testament writings is unknown in Old Testament times. "The books of Moses, as treating of the oldest events, and as containing the received directory for worship, had the place of honor and were mentioned first. But the most obscure scriptural book was regarded as the prophetic word of God."

The second half of the book under review treats of the Promise. Emphasis is laid upon the statement that "Messianic prophecy is doctrine rather than prediction." "As the biography of Jesus is really doctrine rather than biography, and is the heart of the apostolic Christian doctrine, so the prophetic forecast of the Messiah is doctrine

rather than prediction, and is the heart of the religious teachings of the prophets. Certainly we should treat their utterances as predictive; but this by itself is inadequate. They teach a doctrine concerning God's purposes with Israel, intelligible in each stage of Israel's history, so as to be the basis of religious and moral appeal for that age, but growing in fulness from age to age until it becomes the completed doctrine of the Messiah." Dr. Beecher thus formulates his thesis: "God gave a promise to Abraham, and through him to mankind; a promise eternally fulfilled and fulfilling in the history of Israel; and chiefly fulfilled in Jesus Christ, he being that which is principal in the history of Israel." The men of the New Testament, as our author shows, find the Messianic doctrine pervading every part of the Old Testament. "In their minds it takes the form of the one promise. They identify it as the promise made to Abraham for the nations. They recognize the particulars included in it as 'the promise.' They trace it throughout the Old Testament. They appropriate the phraseology in which the Old Testament speaks of it. Further, they preach this promise as the one great thing they have to preach; emphasizing its irrevocability; claiming that Jesus Christ is the culminating fulfillment of it, basing upon it the hope of salvation for the gentiles, connecting it with the whole body of the doctrine of the Gospel."

Already in the book of Genesis the promise to Abraham was the central and comamnding article of theological belief. "Its earliest student found in it a great religious fact, holding the same place in his theology that the fact of Christ holds in ours, something to be believed and taught and practiced for purposes of current living; a doctrine that could be preached, and made pivotal in all attempts at religious persuasions."

Dr. Beecher traces the removal of the Messianic promise to Isaac, to Israel and to David. The prophets enlarge upon the various aspects of the promise. "This is their gospel, as the same promise at a more advanced

stage of fulfillment is the gospel that we preach in the twentieth century."

The author makes a careful study of certain Messianic terms, such as Servant, Messianic King and Yahweh's Ahasidh. "Who is the Servant spoken of in these Isaiah chapters? A certain interpretation replies that the Servant is the people of Israel, and therefore is not Jesus of Nazareth." This interpretation is contradicted by another which affirms that the Servant is Jesus Christ, and therefore is not Israel." "The truth is, that both interpretaions are correct in what they affirm, and incorrect in what they deny." Dr. Beecher adds further on, "If the New Testament writers are correct in regarding Jesus as pre-eminently the representative Israelite, as the antitype of all types, then they are correct in applying directly to him what the prophets say concerning Israel the Servant."

In his closing chapter, Professor Beecher shows that his substitution of the conception of one promise for that of many foretold events, adds immensely to the apologetic value of prophecy.

This book, while containing a good deal that one ought to think through for himself, is one of the most suggestive and helpful of the new books on prophecy. Ministers and Sunday school teachers ought to give it a careful reading.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

Expositions of Holy Scripture—Genesis, Isaiah and Jeremiah. 3 vols. Octo.

By Alexander Maclaren, D. D. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York, 1906.

Dr. Maclaren seems equally at home in either Testament, being an accomplished Hebrew and Greek scholar and an expositor of the first rank. He is reasonably familiar with the critical questions in the realm of biblical scholarship, and his insight into the meaning of Scripture is marvelous. He also has a very happy method of developing and presenting his message. He combines with

profound thought and careful research an almost faultless English style. While enjoying each of the three volumes in the Old Testament field, we have been particularly impressed with his expositions of Isaiah. We heartily commend the series to ministers and Bible students everywhere. JOHN R. SAMPEY.

The Psalms. Vol. II. [LXXIII–CL).

By Rev. T. Wilton Davies, B. A., Ph. D. The Century Bible. **Edinburgh, T. C. & E. C. Jack.**

It is a slight disadvantage that the whole of the Psalms could not have been annotated by the same commentator, but the volume before us is second to none in the series for first-class workmanship. Only one who has toiled in the same field can at all estimate the vast amount of reading and patient research which every page of this commentary unostentatiously discloses. No modern writer on the Psalms has escaped the perusal of Dr. Davies, and the best works have been consulted, not spasmodically, but constantly, verse by verse. The strongest point of the work is, as it should be, the Exegesis. The comments are invariably terse, pithy, and really helpful in removing difficulties. One regrets sometimes that the exigencies of space prevent the author from giving other views than his own for the selection of the student, but this was impracticable—indeed the immense amount of matter that is crowded into this small volume is astonishing. Still one would like to know, e. g., what grounds Dr. Davies has for asserting in the 119th Psalm that "it is not so much the written as the orally handed down Word of God which forms the theme of this long Psalm." Dr. Davies seems unnecessarily cautious as to the admission of Messianic elements in the Psalms: as e. g., when in Ps. 110 he asks: "Is the Psalm Messianic?" and gives the reply: "Looking at it by itself, and without prepossession, one would not say that it is." His eschatological position, in which he deserts Dillman, Smend, Charles and Cheyne, renders necessarily sundry

emendations, which would be uncalled for, we venture to think, on a sounder induction. There are, however, points on which there is abundance of room for difference of view. On the whole the work is very ably done, and Dr. Davies has at once stepped into the front rank of Biblical experts. J. T. MARSHALL.

The Book of Ecclesiastes. A New Metrical Translation with an Introduction and Explanatory Notes.

By Paul Haupt, LL.D. 50 pages, bound in cloth, price 50 cents net. The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

The author's position may best be expressed in his own words; "I believe that the genuine portions of Ecclesiastes were written by a prominent Sadducean physician in Jerusalem, who was born at the beginning of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (175-164) and died in the first decade of the reign of Alexander Jannæus (104-78 B. C.). Ecclesiastes may have been a son of David; he may have been a king in Jerusalem, if we take *king* to mean head of a school." Professor Haupt thinks the author may have worked on the book for more than forty years. "Nietzsche would have called it *eins der erlebesten Buecher.* The three or four interpolations suggesting that this pessimistic poem was a work of the wise King of Israel, Soloman ben —David (about 950 B. C.) may be due to the friends of the author, who edited the book. On the other hand, there are a great many Pharisaic interpolations directly opposing the Epicurean teaching set forth in the poem. The genuine portions of Ecclesiastes are Sadducean and Epicurean; Stoic doctrines are found almost exclusively in the Pharisaic interpolation."

The plain reader wonders how the learned editor discovered so much that is definite as to composite authorship. He is curious to know how the original author could be located with such accuracy in time, party affiliation, professional life, etc. Here are the author's arguments to prove his thesis: "Ecclesiastes must have been a Sadducee; for he doubts the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body (3, 21). He must have been

a physician; otherwise he could not have given the enumeration of the symptoms of senile decay in the beautiful allegorical description at the end of the book. He must have been born under the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (175-164); for in 4, 13-16 he says that he saw the general enthusiasm for the *poor* but wise youth (i. e., Alexander Balas) who succeeded (150 B. C.) to the throne of the *old* and foolish king (i. e., Antiochus Epiphanes). Ecclesiastes also states, at the end of c. 9, that he saw the successful defense of the small place (Gethsura) against the great king (Antiochus Eupator, 163 B. C.)."

After such categorical affirmations as to the author's date and theological affinities, we are almost surprised to read the confession on p. 4: "We have, of course, no mathematical evidence, and I do not claim to have been present when the editorial changes were made, but my theory explains all the features of this remarkable book."

Professor Haupt vindicates the originality of his views as to Ecclesiastes, since his theory, though published recently, had already been elaborated before his classes fourteen years earlier than the appearance of his book. One of the axioms of the modern critical school is that the ancients cared nothing for literary originality and proprietorship. Might not their modern critics learn a lesson of modesty in this regard? Siegfried divides Haupt's pessimistic, Epicurean Sadducee into two parts; the original author being a rank pessimist without any remaining faith, the second contributor to the composite not known as the Book of Ecclesiastes being a Sadducee who glorifies the pleasures of eating and drinking.

If Professor Haupt's views of the composition of Ecclesiastes are correct, then he would be right in the conclusion stated on the opening page of his Introduction, "The genuine portions of Ecclesiastes are out of place in the Canon."

The author's learning is ample, and one who wishes to acquaint himself with the latest critical views as to the difficult Book of Ecclesiastes will find in this treatise a

cheap and convenient manual. The new translation is often felicitious. JOHN R. SAMPEY.

Ausgewäehlte Psalmen uebersetzt und erkläert.

Von Hermann Gunkel Zweite, verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage· Preis 3 M. 20 Pf. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Goettingen, 1905. May be had of Lemcke & Buechner, New York.

Gunkel is famous both for a charming German style, easy for foreign students to understand, and also for a good degree of independence and originality in his critical views. He has given to the public a fresh translation and exposition of a goodly number of the most popular poems in the Hebrew Psalter. The translation has life and movement, and often gives a felicitous rendering of the Hebrew. The author also shows skill in interpreting the psychological experiences of the psalmists. He follows the radical school in his dates. JOHN R. SAMPEY.

Literary Illustrations of the Bible.

Edited by James Moffatt, D. D. The Book of Daniel. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York, 1905.

These brief illustrations are drawn from a wide range of both prose and poetry. Many of them throw light on the text, though others are of the nature of literary padding. JOHN R. SAMPEY.

VI. CHURCH HISTORY.

Baptist and Congregational Pioneers.

By J. H. Shakespeare, M. A. The Kingsgate Press, London, England, 40c.

This little volume of 196 pages contains the fruits of more original research than many larger books, and no student of the origins of English Congregationalists and Baptists can dispense with it. Americans will be surprised to see how these two denominations were originally intertwined in England, till they see that Congregationalists there are simply Baptists arrested in their evolution. The connection has been maintained, owing to the hostile pressure of the Established Church, and therefore the free churches find it natural to emphasize the points wherein they agree, and to combine for much work. Indeed it is to the National Council of Evangelical free churches that this book is due, the best of a series of thirteen to cover Free Church History. If it is a pity that Baptists alone did not demand such a story, it is fortunate that a true—and largely new—account of Baptist origins is now likely to circulate widely among other readers. Henceforth no one can excuse himself if he confounds the semi-socialistic, semi-orthodox Anabaptists of the continent with Baptists. And some may be glad of a reference to an early English Anabaptist work of Robert Cooke, strangely neglected now though it elicited replies from two champions. Particularly fine is the hint that in the evolution of Jacob's church from State Puritanism to strict Baptist principles, the whole times are epitomised, and that it shows the logical issue to which all must at last conform. Of little touches in the book, specially admirable are the sketches of Ainsworth living on his "boiled roots"—Irish potatoes?—and producing commentaries or metrical psalms; of John Smythe the ring-leader of the separation rising up and following the beckoning hand of a properly constructed syllogism.

Has any Virginian enquired what happened to the section of the Ancient Church of 1592 which started the religious emigration in 1619 under Elder Blackwell, and prompted the better-known expedition of the Pilgrim fathers next year? If occasionally Mr. Shakespeare thus leaves a thread unknotted, he gives a splendid specimen of what he can do in his leisure hours when the cares of the Baptist World Congress are added to his usual work. What could not be accomplished to elucidate our history by such a man if he devoted himself to the matter? The story here is chiefly of Holland and London; but there are one or two English districts besides Gainsborough and Scrooby which claim to have produced other pioneers, and a competent investigator might soon enrich our annals and set our early story in new perspective. W. T. WHITLEY.

The History and Life of the Rev. Dr. John Tauler, of Strasbourg; With Twenty-five of his sermons, translated from the German, with Additional Notices of Tauler's Life and Times.

By Susanna Winkworth and a Preface by Charles Kingsley. Published by H. R. Allenson, London. Price 6 shillings.

This is a reprint of an earlier edition but is none the less valuable for that reason. Tauler was one of the greatest preachers of the middle ages and his sermons are of perennial interest. Of course many of them are for Protestant readers marred by Catholic superstitions and errors as well as other faults of the age and church in which he lived. But the principle upon which these twenty-five were selected has almost completely eliminated these objectionable features. They were chosen for their bearing upon practical life and will be found exceedingly stimulating and helpful. Tauler was one of the greatest of the mystics, but little of his metaphysical subtleties appears in these sermons. These sermons are given without emendation and give a fair presentation of Tauler's best preaching. The work of translation was well done, while the notes by the translator are valuable.

Any pastor would find this volume a valuable addition to his library. W. J. McGlothlin.

Rev. John Myles and the Founding of the First Baptist Church in Massachusetts.

By Henry Melville King, Pastor of the First Baptist Church in Providence. Preston & Round, Providence, R. I. 1905.

This neat little book of 112 pages consists of an historical address delivered at the dedication, on June 17, 1905, at Barrington, R. I., of a monument to Myles, together with several important historical documents in the form of apendices. The address is a very interesting account of the life and work of Myles, who in some respects is unique among American Baptists. It throws important light upon the struggle for religious liberty in England and America. To his former monographs the author has here added another of equal, perhaps even greater value. W. J. McGlothlin.

The Life Story of Henry Clay Trumbull; Missionary, Army Chaplain, Editor and Author.

By Philip E. Howard. The Sunday School Times Co., Philadelphia. 1905. pp. 525. Price $1.75 net.

Henry Clay Trumbull, for years the editor of the Sunday School Times, was one of the best-known and most influential Sunday school workers in America. It is doubtful if any other single man has done so much for the elevation and efficiency of the work done in the Sunday schools. For years under his editorial direction the Sunday School Times was an essential help to good teaching.

But he was a man of distinction in many other directions. As an author he produced several books of permanent value; as a traveler he made important contributions to our knowledge of the Holy Land; as a preacher he was effective in the army and elsewhere. The remarkably interesting story of his rich and varied life is admirably told in this work. The author is his son-in-law and was

for several years his business associate. He knew Dr. Trumbull intimately during the later years of his life, and has diligently studied the sources for the earlier years. This is one of the most important of recent biographies. W. J. McGlothlin.

Readings in European History. A Collection of Extracts from the Sources chosen with the purpose of illustrating the progress of culture in Western Europe since the German Invasions.

By James Harvey Robinson, Professor of History in Columbia University. Vol. 1. From the Breaking up of the Roman Empire to the Protestant Revolt. Ginn & Company, Boston, New York, Chicago, London.

The title of this collection of mediaeval documents is sufficiently descriptive. The documents are well chosen and seem to be carefully translated. The collection is intended primarily as a handbook of materials to accompany the editor's "Introduction to the History of Western Europe." It may be used with advantage in connection with courses of lectures on mediæval history, being as well adapted for the Church Historian as for the teacher of secular history. It would be easy, of course, for any teacher of mediæval history to point out the omission of documents that would have enriched the collection and the inclusion of some that might have given way to others of more importance. But the present collection will prove eminently satisfactory to the average teacher. Albert Henry Newman.

Baylor Theological Seminary.

The New Reformation. Recent Evangelical Movements in the Roman Catholic Church.

By John A Bain, M. A. T. & T. Clark, Edingburgh, 1906. Imported by Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York. Pp. 283. Price $1.50 net.

As its name indicates, this work is an account, compiled from the latest sources of the progress of Protestantism among Roman Catholics in all the principal countries of Europe and America. To one who has not kept pace with

these movements or this movement, for it is well nigh universal, the contents will be surprising. For the last six or seven years it has been specially strong and widespread and really deserves the title of a New Reformation. If the movement continues to gather momentum it will certainly accomplish as much in fifty years as was accomplished by the Lutheran Reformation in that period. At present it is strongest in Austria, and in this country alone some 50,000 people have left the Catholic Church since 1898. As children under fourteen are not counted it is probable that as many as one hundred thousand have left the Church. A similar but even more religious secession is in progress in France and Germany. The story is one to make Protestants thank God and take courage. The book is the best account of the whole movement known to me. W. J. McGlothlin.

Sankey's Story of the Gospel Hymns, and of Sacred Songs and Solos.

By Ira. D. Sankey, with an Introduction by Theodore L. Cuyler. The Sunday School Times Co., Philadelphia, 1906. Pp. 272. Price 75 cents net, postage 10 cents.

This little book contains an interesting sketch of the life of Mr. Sankey as a gospel singer and associate of Mr. Moody for many years. There are many thrilling stories of the power of song in bringing men to accept Christ. The body of the book is given to accounts of the origin of many of the best known Gospel Hymns of recent years, and to incidents of the power of these and many of the older hymns as they have been sung by Mr. Sankey and others. Some of these stories were already known, but many of them are new. Pastors would find it full of interesting and helpful incidents and illustrations.

W. J. McGlothlin.

The Life of John Wesley.

By C. T. Winchester, Professor of English Literature in Wesleyan University. Pp. 301. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1906.

The many and valuable lives of John Wesley already

before the public do not make this one superfluous. The subject is of perennial interest. John Wesley is confessedly one of the great characters of Christian history. The revival which he with others started has subsequently given color to the Christianity of the English speaking world and its power is not yet exhausted. This new Life of Wesley is the result of a fresh and thorough study of the sources. It is not written "by a Methodist for the Methodists," nor does it deal with Wesley primarily as the religious reformer. The attempt is made to set forth the man, with all his varied interests and marvellous activities, before the general reader rather than for the student of religious history. The work loses nothing in value or popular interest in this attempt. In fact, Prof. Winchester has done his work admirably. There is not a dull page in the book. If it induces the ministry of his own and other denominations to study afresh the life of the great reformer, it will render a good service to the kingdom of God. W. J. McGlothlin.

Proceedings of the Baptist Congress for 1905.

Price 50 cents. Baptist Congress Publishing Co., New York.

These papers are always live and interesting and serve to accent the diversity of opinion among Baptists on current questions. A. T. R.

First Two Decades of the Student Volunteer Movement.

The Student Volunteer Movement, 3 West 29th Street, New York.

The rapid growth of this movement is well set forth in this report. A. T. R.

A History of the Inquisition of Spain.

By Henry Charles Lea, LL. D. In four volumes. Vol. I, pp. 620. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1906.

Henry Charles Lea is perhaps better known in Europe than any other American historian. His works on the "Inquisition of the Middle Ages," "Auricular Confession and Indulgences," "Sacerdotal Celibacy," etc., are

quoted as authorities in the lecture rooms of the German universities. Liesure, wealth and native ability have made it possible for him to obtain and utilize the published and unpublished sources to a rare degree that gives him a unique place among American historians.

The present work, of which only the first volume has as yet appeared, is to be an exhaustive treatment of that terrible engine of oppression and destruction known as the Spanish Inquisition. It is in a sense a continuation of his "History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages." As was to be expected this first volume manifests the same exhaustive and painstaking work we have learned to look for in Dr. Lea's productions. The conclusions are based almost wholly on original sources, some of which had never been utilized before. It falls into two broad divisions, first the "Origin and Establishment" of the Inquisition, and second, its "Relations with the State." After sketching in a masterful manner the disorders that prevailed at the beginning of the reigns of Ferdinand and Isabella, he sets forth the gradual development of the persecuting spirit in Spain under the fostering care of the church. It was directed against the Jews and Moors and finally resulted in the expulsion from Spain or the forced conversion of all of both races. The genuineness of these *conversas* or "new Christians" was doubtful, and the Spanish Inquisition was set up primarily to hunt out and destroy these suspected Christians. Its establishment began at Seville in 1480 and it was gradually extended over all Spain. It differed from the Inquisition elsewhere and also from the previous Inquisition in Spain in that it was controlled neither by the bishops nor by the Dominicans, but by the pope and the crown and at times was largely independent of both these powers. It was the exercise of irresponsible power that made it so terrible.

The work is too detailed for popular reading, but for those who wish to really understand the Spanish Inquisition it will prove to be indespensable.

W. J. McGlothlin.

Primitive Christian Education.

By Geraldine Hodgson. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1906. Imported by Chas. Scribner's Sons, N. Y. Price $1.50. Pp. 1, 287.

In this volume the author discusses the schools of Roman Empire in the first four Chirstian centuries, the attitude of the Christians toward these heathen schools and toward education in general and the methods and aims of the great Christian teachers down to Jerome. The work has a good deal of irrelevant matter which does not bear directly on Christian education and the author is too desirous of making out a favorable case for Christian schools and teaching; but it contains much useful information on a very interesting and important subject which has not received sufficient attention. Christianity and learning early became friends and true Christianity and true learning have gone hand in hand ever since. The work is replete with quotations bearing upon the subject in hand and cannot be omitted by any student of the history of education or any one interested in early Christian education. W. J. McGlothlin.

IX. MISCELLANEOUS.

Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache.

Von Dr. Raphael Kühner. II Teil Zweiter Band, Besorgt von Dr. Bernhard Gerth. 1904. Hahnsche Buchhandlung, Hannover und Leipzig, Germany. To be had also of Lemcke & Buechner, New York.

This able volume completes the revision in four large volumes of Kühner's famous Greek Grammar. It greatly needed revision in the light of modern comparative grammar. The first two volumes are the work of Prof. Blass, of Halle, who treated the forms. The two concluding volumes are the work of Prof. Gerth, of Leipzig, and discuss the syntax. Without any doubt they form the greatest grammar of the Greek language now in existence. They can, of course, even to German students, be only works of reference because of their great size, but the Greek scholars all over the world are to be congratulated on the successful completion of this great task.

A. T. Robertson.

Essays in Application.

By Henry Van Dyke, Charles Scribner's Sons. 1905. Pp. X, 282.

In this volume of essays we are not to look for "a defense, or even a statement, of a complete system of philosophy or faith" but characteristically lucid and luring expositions of principles of philosophy and faith by a man who believes that "life is the test of thought, rather than thought the test of life" and that, therefore, "we should be able to get light on the real worth of a man's theories, ideals, beliefs, by looking at the shape they would give to human existence if they were faithfully applied." There are twelve of these studies in real life, social, religious and personal. Some of the most striking are: "Is the World Growing Better?" "Ruling Classes in a Democracy," "The Heritage of American Ideals,"

"The Church in the City," "The Creative Ideal in Education," "The School of Life." It needs only to be said that Dr. Van Dyke has given us in this volume some of his best work. W. O. Carver.

Great Pedagogical Essays.

By F. V. N. Painter, A. M., D. D., Professor in Roanoke College. Author of "A History of Education," etc. Cloth, 12mo, 426 pages. Price $1.25. American Book Company, New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago.

Here we have a compilation of selections from twenty-six of the greatest theorists and workers in education from Plato to Spencer. The design is to place before the student of the history of education the chief sources of that history. A brief biographical sketch, usually two pages, introduces the selections from each author. This sketch states in each instance the service to education rendered by the author and the extent of his writings on the subject of education. The compiler has done well a service which he naturally wonders no one has undertaken before. W. O. Carver.

Friedrich Schiller. A Sketch of his Life and an Appreciation of his Poetry.

By Paul Carus. The Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago. 1905.

The centennial of the death of Schiller was fitly celebrated last year in Germany and this volume is a beautiful memorial of the great poet. There are a large number of handsome illustrations and copious selections from his writings are made in the German and with a metrical translation. The facts of his life are briefly told and then discriminating discussions of his philosophy and poetry follow. Schiller was devout in spirit though a free lance in his religious views. He was an eclectic in his philosophy and religion. But it is a pleasure to read this estimate of one of the most original spirits of the eighteenth century. His poems are admired not only in Ger-

many, but all over the world. His life was far nobler than that of Goethe, his great contemporary.

A. T. Robertson.

The Essays of Elia.

By Charles Lamb. The MacMillan Co., New York. 1905. 16mo, cloth, 25 cents.

A charming volume of Macmillan's Pocket American and English Classics, with an appreciative and delightful Introduction and illuminative notes by Helen J. Robins, teacher of English in Miss Baldwin's school, Bryn Mawr. Miss Robins tells us in a fresh and pathetic way of the one tragic happening in Lamb's life which determined his career for him—the only fact of his life which never found its way into his writings, and which was even unknown to many of his friends during his lifetime, but which pointed out to him the path which he followed, "courageous and faithful to the end." It was in the year of that happening and touching that experience, that Coleridge wrote: "I look upon you as a man called by sorrow and anguish and a strange desolation of hope into quietness, and a soul set apart and made peculiar to God." The story of the life thus "set apart," and the cream of the writings of "one of the rarest and most delicate of the humorists of England" are here put within the easy reach of all.

Geo. B. Eager.

The Changing Order.

By Oscar Lovell Triggs, Ph. D. Oscar L. Triggs Publishing Co., Chicago, 1905.

The author accepts the term Democracy as broadly indicative of a new order of ideas, an attitude of mind opposed to the monarchic and aristocratic, a new spirit of life, an old order changing, yielding place to new, or viewed in the concrete, as the uprise of the people and their complete utterance and exercise in politics, art, education, religion and all other forms of human activity. Because the foundations of the existing social order are

largely aristocratic, the new ideas are obscured and their effects neutralized or destroyed by the stream of traditionary tendency. His avowed purpose in these chapters, which he calls *Series I.,* is to separate, as far as he may, the new order from the old, to gather materials for a definition, leaving the final formulation of it to those who shall live within the new world yet to be; dealing, in the meantime, with certain phenomena of the present that seem to be the effects of the new spirit and the new order now in its incipiency. He attempts no elaborate description of democratic polity in the sphere of government, deals with what he regards as the more vital and subtle effects of democracy—its radiation in art, industry, education and religion. He finds in Carlyle,' 'the Apostle of work;'' Maeterlinck, ''the prophet of the humble;'' William Morris, ''the laureate of sweating men,'' indeed in Chaucer, who gave the miller and the plowman a place among his '' pilgrims;'' in Burns, ''who sang the glories of home and field,'' and in Wordsworth, ''who depicted with all sincerity, the dignity of the commonplace,'' ''the historic tokens of democracy.''. He finds in the world of art, and of education, and, last of all, of religion, ''the turmoil of transition''—the spirit of democracy penetrating into all realms of thought and life—''prophets arising upon whose lips the word king is never heard, and in whose minds the conception of kingship is never formed, even concerning God—prophets, that is, of cosmic democracy,''—''even the doctrine of immortality, once aristocratic, is now all-inclusive and democratic!''

These are the types of phenomena the author deals with in the freest, most engaging, though not always the most convincing way. ''What is needed at this hour, he says, is not to establish free government in Church or State, but to develop free men—''not,'' as William Morris once said, ''to establish socialism, but to educate socialists.'' He turns for illustration of what may be done in formulating a new and modernized theology to Walt Whit-

man's "Leaves of Grass," and quotes with utter approval his words: "The time has certainly come to begin to discharge the idea of religion from mere ecclesiasticism, from Sundays and churches and church-going, and to assign it to that general position, chiefest, most indispensable, most exhilarating, to which the others are to be adjusted, inside of all human character, and education and affairs. The people, especially the young men and women of America, must begin to learn that religion is something far, far different from what they supposed. It is indeed, too important to the power and perpetuity of the new world to be consigned any longer to the churches, old or new, Catholic or Prostestant—Saint this, or Saint that. It must be consigned to democracy en masse, and to literature."

GEO. B. EAGER.

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

The next regular session will begin October 2d and continue eight months.

Thorough courses of study are given in all departments of theological education.

All studies are elective.

Four degrees are conferred, including a post-graduate degree.

The regular course for the degree of Master in Theology covers three years.

An admirable course of one year in English, without degree, is adapted to the needs of busy pastors who cannot remain for a more extended period.

A great Library is open to all students.

Cost of living in Louisville is not high.

For Catalogue or other information, address

E. Y. MULLINS, President,
Louisville, Ky.

For information as to financial aid, address

B. P. SMITH,
Room 10, New York Hall,
Louisville, Ky.